

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

VERMONT ROYSTER: SUCCESS
AFTER STRUGGLE

HON. STEPHEN L. NEAL

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 9, 1988

Mr. NEAL. Mr. Speaker, my hometown newspaper, the Winston-Salem Journal, recently published an excellent article by Linda Brinson on Vermont C. Royster, a native North Carolinian who achieved national prominence as editor of the Wall Street Journal. Mr. Royster is now retired and lives in Chapel Hill, NC, but he still writes occasional columns.

It wasn't easy for Mr. Royster, as a young man, to break into the news business. But he persevered. I found Mrs. Brinson's account of Mr. Royster's career fascinating, and I think it could be a great inspiration for young people who often find the going rough when they're trying to get started in their careers.

Mr. Speaker, I ask that the article on Mr. Royster from the July 3, 1988, Winston-Salem Journal be included in the RECORD at this point. The article follows:

VERMONT ROYSTER

(By Linda Brinson)

CHAPEL HILL.—It was a beautiful morning on the patio behind Vermont Royster's comfortable white house on a quiet street near the University of North Carolina. Birds twittered in the ample shade trees, and there was only a hint of the heat that would come later in the day.

Vermont Royster, who at 74 calls himself "the most retired person you ever saw—I'm a retired editor, columnist, professor and naval officer"—was not enjoying the bucolic setting.

He was suspicious of the reporter who was interviewing him with the aid of a tape recorder. "Reporters don't know how to take notes any more," he grumped. "I remember once going to see Jimmy Carter down in his hometown, this was after he was elected but before he was inaugurated, and chatting with him in his living room down there. And he expressed great surprise that I did not use a tape recorder. But I tried a tape recorder only once and I found the trouble transcribing the damn thing was just more work."

He was suspicious of the photographer who kept snapping a camera. "I have a question for the photographer," he grumbled. "Why do newspapers keep running photographs of somebody sliding into second base? He looks exactly like the guy who slud into it before. And why do they keep running the same basketball pictures of people running up and down in their underwear? It doesn't make any sense."

Most of all, he was restless. It's a presidential election year, and the heat of the campaigns was building faster than the heat of the day. But for the first time in many years, Vermont Royster was not planning to be part of the Wall Street Journal's delega-

tion to the Democratic and Republican national conventions.

Albert Hunt, the Washington Bureau chief of The Wall Street Journal, had called recently to make arrangements. But Royster regretfully declined. Frances, his wife of 51 years, is ill, and Royster does not want to leave her.

In 1936, when he was just cutting his teeth as a reporter in the Washington Bureau of The Wall Street Journal, Royster went on his own time over to Philadelphia and managed to get credentials for the Democratic National Convention. By 1940, he attended both parties' conventions as a reporter, and, except for 1944, when he was serving in the Navy in World War II, he has not missed a convention since.

If he's got to be at home, he'd really rather be inside, maybe writing a column to send up to the Journal ("I write one when I feel like it, and they run it when they get around to it"), or showing somebody the "picture wall" in his den.

That's where he has pictures of himself, often with Frances, meeting many of the important people in politics from the past 50 years. He's proudest, he said, of the framed invitation to a White House reception with the Roosevelts, dated 1938. And then there is the photo of the Roysters with Ronald and Nancy Reagan at the White House, when Royster was awarded the Presidential Medal of Freedom in 1986.

The wall holds, too, his two Pulitzer Prizes—one for editorial writing in 1953, and one for commentary in 1984, when he was 70—and other awards.

The centerpiece of the wall is the large world map, studded with redtopped pins indicating places Royster has been on his travels. The United States is thick with pins, and Europe nearly as crowded. Pins dot Africa, South America, Australia, China, the Soviet Union—just about everywhere in the world except for the Arctic and Antarctica.

Another wall is devoted to family pictures—the daughters, Bonnie and Eleanor; the granddaughters, Heather and Shelley. The story of a close family is told in birthday and wedding photos. And then there are the pictures of the boats, including the yacht the Roysters lived on for about a year in 1971, while making the transition from editor of The Wall Street Journal to Kenan professor of journalism and public affairs at UNC.

"I've spent my whole life going in circles," Royster said. But the 35 years that elapsed between the time Vermont Royster was graduated from UNC and his return were eventful and fruitful. His rise to prominence at The Wall Street Journal in many ways paralleled the newspaper's rise to national eminence.

When Royster arrived at the university as a freshman in the fall of 1931, he had no ideas of becoming a journalist. Born in Raleigh, he spent most of his boyhood there, except for the first three years of his life, when his family lived in Chapel Hill. His father was a professor of classics at the university, who stopped teaching for a while to run a candy factory; indeed, teaching at the

university was something of a tradition in the Royster family.

His unusual first and middle names are part of another family tradition. In the days when large families were commonplace, an ancestor, James Daniel Royster, came up with the idea of distinguishing his children by naming all of them after states.

The custom, Royster said, had died out by his father's generation, "fortunately." But his mother insisted on naming her first son after his grandfather.

Bearing the names "Vermont Connecticut" made life difficult for a young boy.

So did being at least a couple of years younger than everybody else in his classes. Already a good reader when he started first grade, he was moved up to third grade by midyear.

"I had a scrappy youth," he said. "I was always getting into fights. But later, once I got into journalism, I found the name to be an advantage. People might not remember what I wrote, but they always remembered the name."

Besides being younger than his classmates, Royster was small for his age. As a grown man, he stands 5 feet 6 inches.

His face has often been likened to that of a bulldog, and it matches his reputation for being a curmudgeon. The feistiness has stayed with him all of his life.

The atmosphere in his Raleigh home was scholarly, old-fashioned and disciplined. He began learning Latin at about the age that most children are learning to read. When Royster finished high school at 15, he expected to enroll immediately at the university, but his father insisted on sending him for two years to the Webb School, an old-fashioned, classical-education prep school in Bell Buckle, Tenn.

When he did start college at Chapel Hill, Royster majored in classical languages, mainly, he said, because for him they would be "crib" courses. He credits that choice with his election to Phi Beta Kappa during his junior year.

He never took a journalism course, but, looking for something to fill his spare time, he stumbled into a job on The Daily Tar Heel, the student newspaper. He also worked as a Chapel Hill correspondent for the Durham Morning Herald.

At graduation time, Royster found that he did not have much career preparation.

"When you get out of college with a nodding acquaintance with Euripides, that's really not much help. So being unqualified for anything else, I naturally turned to journalism."

Earning a living was a pressing concern, because Royster had found the love of his life. "But I had the old-fashioned notion that you didn't get married until you could support a wife," he said.

His blue eyes still sparkle with the memory of his first glimpse of Frances Claypoole—"I met my wife on July 4, 1931. She was 16 and I was 17. We went together from then on. She went to St. Mary's and then Greensboro while I went to Carolina."

In 1935, age 21, with no job in sight in North Carolina, Royster "went to New York to conquer the world."

● This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.

Finally, he landed a job as a busboy in a cafeteria at Broadway and 72nd Street. Then he moved on to a job as a messenger for a bank.

His first break in journalism came with a temporary job with the old New York City News Association, a wire service for the city. He covered all the routine stories—police, night court.

"It was good training, but it was only temporary, and the young man whose place I took had the ill grace to get well," he said.

Unemployed again, Royster noticed a copy of the Wall Street Journal at a newsstand. "I had heard of it, but I thought it was all stocks and bonds and I wasn't interested in those."

"But at least it was a newspaper, and it came out every day, and it was published in New York. So I hid myself down to the Journal office at Broad Street, found that the editor's office was on the third floor, and got in the elevator and went up there."

The guard happened to be away from his desk, so Royster walked into the newsroom and looked around.

"In one corner was a glass partition, obviously the office of the boss. So I went over and stood in the door. At the desk was a gray-haired man; he must have been all of 40. Pretty soon he pushed his glasses up and looked at me, and said, 'What do you want?'"

"I said, 'I want a job.'"

"He said, 'What can you do?'"

"I looked around his office, and I said, 'If you'll give me a broom, I'll sweep up this office,' because it was all cluttered up with papers and stuff."

Before the day was out, Royster had a job. It was, he said "about one step up from a copy boy," and it was supposed to be only temporary, but he worked hard.

About three months later, the man in the office—who turned out to be William H. Grimes, the managing editor—stopped him in the corridor and asked if he would like to go to Washington.

Royster said, "Yes, sir." The man said, "When can you go?" Royster replied, "Give me two hours."

He reported the next morning to Bernard Kilgore, the Journal's bureau manager in Washington. Later, he learned that Grimes had made the same offer to other young staffers, but that Royster's eagerness had won him the job.

Kilgore, who soon became the Journal's managing editor and then general manager, had a vision of modernizing the paper and making it national in scope. Vermont Royster, now a Washington correspondent, became a key figure in those plans. He was assigned to "inconsequential stories," then the Agriculture Department, then Congress and the Supreme Court. It was heady stuff, meeting important government figures, writing major national stories.

Frances Claypoole moved to vice job as a secretary with the State Department, and in June 1937, with Royster's salary now at "the magnificent sum of \$25 a week," they got married.

World War II interrupted his budding career and family life. In what he now calls a mistake, Royster had become a Naval Reserve officer in 1939. Much to his shock, the year before Pearl Harbor, "President Roosevelt, that S.O.B., called up the National Guard and Naval Reserve for one year active duty."

Royster's one year of active duty turned into five years as a naval officer, serving mostly aboard ships in the Atlantic, the Pacific and the Caribbean.

It didn't take him long to pick up the pieces after the war was over, however. He was made the Washington Bureau chief for the Journal about a year later, and after a couple of years in that job he moved to New York as chief political reporter. Then he wrote editorials and Sunday special assignment pieces. The 1953 Pulitzer, awarded not for a particular editorial but for his work in general, gave his career another boost.

By the mid-1950s, Royster's forcefully opinionated, highly principled, old-line, Southern-conservative voice was essentially the editorial voice of the increasingly influential Wall Street Journal.

In 1957, his greatest ambition was fulfilled, when he was named the editor of the newspaper. Later, he attained other positions, including that of senior vice president of Dow Jones, the Journal's parent company. But he said that he always considered being editor as his greatest accomplishment.

In his recent autobiography, *My Own, My Country's Time: A Journalist's Journey*, Royster recalls that he asked when he became editor if the temporary job Grimes had given him in 1938 could finally be considered permanent.

The national prominence of The Wall Street Journal certainly seemed permanent by that time, and as its principal spokesman, Royster was sought out by the powerful and the famous. No matter whom he was dealing with, he was the same crusty, nononsense, highly principled newsman.

Al Hunt, the current Washington Bureau chief, recalled a classic story about Royster, or "Roy," as he is called by his friends at the newspaper:

"Roy went in to interview John Kennedy right after he had been elected president, and Kennedy tried real hard to find something that he and the editorial page of The Wall Street Journal agreed on."

"When Roy went in, Kennedy congratulated him on the Journal's editorial on free trade. Roy said, 'Mr. President, we've been for free trade long before you got there, and we will be long after you leave.'"

Royster, Hunt said, did a great deal toward expanding the scope of The Wall Street Journal beyond business and economic news. He and Allen Otten, another former Washington Bureau chief, were "in the '50s and '60s such giants in their political analysis that they really did make this paper become a serious paper in political journalism," Hunt said.

"Roy really is a living legend. I'm a real Vermont Royster fan. I don't think I've ever read anyone in American journalism who writes as beautifully as Vermont Royster. I can read a column I totally disagree with and be impressed because he writes so well," he said.

Hunt said that he also values Royster as a friend and adviser.

"When I first met him, I thought he was one of the great curmudgeons of all times. I was kind of awed by him. Then I got to know him and I found that besides his brilliance and his eloquence, he really is one of the kindest men I've ever known."

"He is an extraordinary figure who, for all of his bluster, is full of kindness, great insights; he is incredibly supportive and really a remarkable human being."

"He has only one fault," said Hunt, an alumnus of rival Wake Forest University. "He is a graduate of the University of North Carolina."

Royster has a wealth of memories about the big stories, and about the stories that never made it into print. One of his favorite memories is of the 1948 presidential election, when "Harry fooled all of us."

But he didn't completely fool Royster, who was impressed by Harry Truman's campaigning. He wrote an analysis for the Journal that began, "By all the polls and portents, Thomas E. Dewey will be the next president of the United States. But it's hard to see why."

Bill Grimes, the editor, killed the story, telling Royster that once Dewey won, the newspaper would look bad and Royster's relationship with the new president would be strained.

"Of course, Truman was elected, and I was mad as hell," Royster said.

Physical problems and a diagnosis of carcinoma led to Royster's decision early in 1971 to retire as editor and senior vice president. He decided to accept an offer of a William R. Kenan professorship at the University of North Carolina, teaching journalism and political science. For many years, he continued to write a regular column for the Journal from Chapel Hill, and he won his second Pulitzer only four years ago.

He said he found that he enjoyed teaching a great deal, and he also enjoyed the flexibility of an academic job. If he wanted to take a trip and do some extra writing, he could always take a semester off. His major advice to aspiring journalists, he said, was "Get it right, and try to get your spelling right."

He also often told his students that "going to journalism school probably won't hurt you very much," and he tried to persuade them to take plenty of courses in history, economics and other subjects.

"Get as broad an education as possible, that's what I used to preach," he said.

Richard Cole, the dean of the UNC School of Journalism, said that Royster "brought a depth and a range of expertise to the school that was badly needed then and is always badly needed." Cole said that he would like to see a Vermont Royster-Dow Jones professorship in business journalism established "as a lasting tribute to him."

Royster, with only a hint of humor, insists that he was fired from his teaching position. "They use the word 'retired' because of my age, but as far as I'm concerned, I was fired," he said. He does, however, still frequently speak to journalism classes.

And, in spite of criticism and doomsayers, in spite of great changes in the field, he said he thinks that American newspaper journalism is alive and well. "I've got lots of quarrels with it, but I think it's better now than it has ever been, all in all."

"I think the newspapers do a much better job now of covering the world. And by and large the attitude of reporters is more thoughtful and more devoted to trying to just tell the story."

Whether he goes to this year's conventions or not, Royster stays well informed.

But he's not about to say who he thinks will win the election in November.

"I went out of the predicting business in 1948," he said.

WHAT IS A DRUG-FREE SCHOOL ZONE?

HON. ROBERT J. LAGOMARSINO

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 9, 1988

Mr. LAGOMARSINO. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call to the attention of my colleagues an article which appeared recently in the Washington Post concerning a new approach being used in the State of New Jersey to combat drugs, especially in the schools. The article follows:

[From the Washington Post, July 31, 1988]

WHAT IS A DRUG-FREE SCHOOL ZONE?

(New Jersey's attorney general explains an idea that some officials in Prince George's County would like to see adopted in their state. Cary Edwards is New Jersey's attorney general. This is adapted from a statement he released earlier this summer.)

"Drug-Free School Zone" proclaim brand-new blue-and-white signs springing up all across the state. These signs, unlike any other in the country, have generated a great deal of discussion and have raised a number of questions. What is a "drug-free school zone"? What is hoped to be accomplished by posting signs?

The signs are designed to heighten public awareness about New Jersey's tough new drug laws, and to put people on notice about the existence and location of the recently created drug-free school zones.

Under the new law, drug-free school zones extend 1,000 feet in all directions from the outer boundaries of every elementary and secondary school in the state. The zones are not limited to public schools, but include private and parochial schools as well. The law now provides that anyone distributing drugs within these school zones faces increased punishment. Specifically, a dealer who operates in a school zone is subject to a minimum mandatory term of three years' imprisonment with no possibility of parole.

The especially tough punishment for drug-free school zone offenders, however, is not restricted to dealers. A person, juvenile or adult, who merely uses or possesses an illicit drug within a school zone faces a mandatory 100 hours of community service. This is in addition to the stern sanctions that apply to all drug offenses, including a cash penalty of \$500, which is returned to the community for drug education and prevention and the mandatory revocation or postponement of a driver's license for at least six months and up to two years.

Are we simply encouraging dealers to set up shop just outside the school zone boundaries? Wouldn't it be better simply to post signs proclaiming a drug-free New Jersey?

A drug-free New Jersey—not a warning on signs—is our ultimate goal. Tough laws alone cannot achieve that goal. But we can take immediate steps to rid schools and the areas adjacent to schools of drug-trafficking activities. Why focus on schools?

Our new law recognizes, correctly in my view, that if we are ultimately to win the war on drugs, we can succeed only by reducing the demand for illicit substances. This, in turn, will largely depend on the new education programs we're putting into our schools designed to teach our young people how and why they should say no.

We must, therefore, be certain that schools and the areas around them are safe havens for children, not marketplaces for

drug dealers, or users. By vigorously enforcing our drug-free school zone plan, law enforcement will fulfill part of its vital role in reducing demand. The facts are that almost one-third of children try drugs before the ninth and 10th grade and about two-thirds by the time they finish high school.

Children should not be able to look out their classroom windows and see a drug deal taking place. They should not be able to find used "crack" vials littered around school playgrounds. They should not be propositioned to buy or use drugs while walking to school or in school buildings.

It doesn't matter, by the way, whether a sign is posted at every point along a school perimeter or whether a drug offender actually sees a sign. It's not relevant whether a dealer even knows whether he is operating within a drug-free school zone. The dealer is subject to tougher penalties whether or not he knows about the zone.

But knowing of the drug-free school zones and knowing what a violation means will speed the process of achieving our goal: to get the user and the pusher 1,001 feet away from schools.

CONGRESSIONAL BLACK CAUCUS CITES DANGERS OF DEATH PENALTY

HON. JOHN CONYERS, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 9, 1988

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to insert into the RECORD the following letter from the Congressional Black Caucus to Speaker JIM WRIGHT urging him not to include a death penalty provision in the drug bill. The letter directs the Speaker's attention to arguments contained in a recent Washington Post article authored by the chairman of the Select Committee on Narcotics, CHARLES RANGEL. It points up the strong concern that the CBC members have over the inequity of the death penalty. While blacks comprise 11 percent of the population in the United States, they constitute 40 percent of those on death row. Clearly there are racial biases which affect the imposition of the death penalty, which cannot be tolerated in our criminal justice system.

Substantial evidence has been brought to my attention during hearings held by my subcommittee which shows that the race of both the defendant and the victim plays an important role in determining who is sentenced to death as punishment for the crime of murder. Those who kill whites are far more likely to be targeted for execution than those who kill blacks. This situation raises a serious constitutional question of whether the defendants are being denied equal protection of the law. The "death to drug trafficker" provisions which have been circulated thus far do not provide adequate protection against racial discrimination. Therefore, it would be a mistake to permit the use of the death penalty on the Federal level.

On April 21, 1988, I introduced H.R. 4442, the Racial Justice Act, which provides capital defendants a reasonable opportunity to establish an equal protection—14th amendment—violation. However, until the bill is enacted, the process of imposing death sentences will remain unfair and unjust.

CONGRESSIONAL BLACK CAUCUS,
CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
Washington, DC, August 4, 1988.

HON. JIM WRIGHT,

Speaker of the House, House of Representatives, The Capitol, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: My colleagues in the Congressional Black Caucus have asked that I write to formally associate the CBC with the remarks of our colleague and Chairman of the House Select Committee on Narcotics, Representative Charles Rangel, in his recent Washington Post editorial urging that the death penalty not be included in the new drug bill.

As you know, Congressman Rangel has been working on the drug question since long before popular attention focused on this issue. He has effectively made the distinction between an anti-drug program that is in fact tough, and one that merely masquerades as being tough. These charades are often at the enormous expense of racial bias and the loss of innocent life.

As Representatives of communities that are disproportionately plagued by the drug abuse problem, we are pleased that a number of members are now willing to join with us in what has been an ongoing effort to stop the scourge of drugs in our communities. Nevertheless, we are deeply disturbed that some are using the nation's current focus on the drug problem to enact controversial measures which can only detract from the unified approach that will be necessary to make inroads against the drug crisis. Current proposals to authorize a federal death penalty for drug related crimes are just such measures.

Members of the Congressional Black Caucus have studied with great care, evidence spanning more than fifteen years of death sentences and executions in the United States which clearly indicates that race determines who will be sentenced to die as punishment and who will receive a sentence other than death. We have come to know that factors such as the severity of the crime, whether a gun was used in the commission of the crime, or even the prior criminal history of the defendant are not as relevant as the defendant's race when the death penalty is involved.

In light of last year's Supreme Court decision in *McCleskey v. Kemp*, in which the Court charged legislators with the responsibility of evaluating the evidence of race discrimination in the application of the death penalty. A number of Members of Congress, including members of this Caucus, have co-sponsored H.R. 4442, the Racial Justice Act. That legislation is designed to address these critical concerns. Unfortunately, the House has not yet had an adequate opportunity to consider this important item.

We strongly oppose calls for the death penalty in the drug bill and feel that legislative measures currently proposed may themselves extend the infamous legacy of a racially biased death penalty to the federal level. Forcing a debate on such an emotionally charged topic can only draw us farther from the unified moral approach that is necessary to mount an effective campaign against what has become one of the great tragedies of our society, drug abuse.

If, a death penalty proposal does become the focus of legislative debate, the Members of the CBC have indicated their intent to oppose this measure. We will aggressively pursue an opportunity for extensive debate on the numerous constitutional, procedural, legal and moral issues raised in the various death penalty proposals, and seek an oppor-

tunity to offer amendments to address them. In our view, as the distinguished Chairman of the Select Committee on Narcotics points out, our energies would be better spent hammering out the specifics of a cohesive and comprehensive drug strategy.

Sincerely,

MERVYN M. DYMALLY,
Chairman.

[From the Washington Post, July 6, 1988]

(By Charles B. Rangel)

DRUGS AND THE DEATH PENALTY

Our focus on fighting a real war on drugs is threatened with really going off course now. Over the past few weeks we have allowed ourselves to be distracted by talk that legalization or "zero tolerance" or "user account-ability" is the answer to society's enormously complex and critical drug problem. Now the death penalty is being bandied about as the cure-all-of-the-week.

The Senate recently passed a bill to allow the death penalty for drug traffickers convicted of murder. The measure passed by a wide margin, and a similar measure is being advocated by some House members.

Those who think the death penalty is going to force the drug problem over the horizon and out of our lives are fooling themselves. The drug lords will hardly be scrambling for cover when their radars home in on capital punishment here in the United States.

Even as the death penalty would be imposed upon some of these drug dealers, the flow of drugs across our borders would be as fast and as furious as ever.

Drug dealers already face a certain amount of risk in keeping their billion-dollar industry alive anyway. They constantly face the real prospect of being murdered by one of their competitors. The death penalty would not even increase the cost of doing business for them. It alters the risks very little.

The death penalty in this case is a smoke-screen for real action on the drug crisis. It is a camouflage sprung on the American people at a time when they are begging for a noble and valiant response to our nation's narcotics crisis and the national security threat that drug abuse and drug trafficking present. It is a diversion from the critical action that we all know needs to be taken, and soon, to put these merchants out of business.

All the death penalty would do for us is give the appearance of doing something about the drug problem for a short time. The streetcorner deals, the flow of drugs across our border, the senseless killings and robberies and the overdoses would continue. But that's okay. We feel better and safer because somebody somewhere is paying the ultimate price.

What the death penalty would not do for us is help us come up with a plan to seal our borders from the flow of drugs. It would not help coordinate anti-drug efforts. It would not bring forth the vast amount of resources that we know we must commit to fight the war as we know we should.

The death penalty would not increase the money we spend on treatment and education, or give jobs and skills and a sense of self-worth to the poor and forgotten who often depend heavily on these illicit substances because they have nothing to lose.

The death penalty also would not help bring about what is needed: a hemispheric summit between heads of state to discuss strategies for turning back the drug tide. And it would not stop poor farmers in Boliv-

ia and Peru, for example, from growing coca leaves.

Most important, the flow of drugs would not be impeded because of the death penalty. Look at Florida. That state has had the death penalty for years, but it remains the worst spot for the importation of illicit narcotics to the United States.

The death penalty presents serious drawbacks under any circumstances.

The most glaring obstruction is that the sentence leaves no room for error. We may not want to think about it, but errors do occur in bringing people to justice.

Perhaps the most chilling example death penalty foul-ups occurred in Florida in 1983. Young Shabaka Sugliani Waglini came within 15 hours of execution after 10 years on Florida's death row before a three-judge Circuit Court panel in Atlanta stayed the execution on grounds that the case needed a closer look. The ruling came after officials already had measured Waglini, poor and black, for his burial clothes and had offered him a choice of last meals.

From that point on until just before Waglini was set for a retrial last year it filtered out that the prosecutor had hidden evidence and that a key witness had lied. When the witness admitted last year to having lied at the first trial, Florida prosecutors dropped the poorly handled case.

There is no disputing the fact that when it comes to the death penalty, the long, curved blade of the grim judicial reaper extends farther when the defendant is minority. According to the NAACP Legal Defense Fund, 836 of the 2,048 inmates on death row as of May 1, 1988, are black. Blacks make up 40 percent of the death row inhabitants, but only 11 percent of the nation's population.

It has been the custom of the society, and of other civilized societies, to build prisons and mete out long-term punishments for heinous crimes. Let's stick with incarceration. Let's build more prisons. Let's make them more secure. Let's make inmates sit back and think for the rest of their lives how dumb it was to commit murder, rape, robbery or sell drugs. Let's not take the quick way out, but more importantly, let's not have ourselves open to more Shabaka Waglini cases. Has anybody ever heard of life without parole?

RUNNING FOR HUNGER

HON. GERRY E. STUDDS

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 9, 1988

Mr. STUDDS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to pay tribute to the American runners who will soon be traveling to the Soviet Union to participate in the Moscow International Peace Marathon.

The Moscow race brings together runners from across the globe whose goal is to raise funds to help alleviate world hunger—our American athletes are all members of the California-based "World Runners."

I would especially like to congratulate the residents of Cape Cod who have raised nearly \$20,000 for Ox Fam and the Heifer Project, as well as their own travel expenses to Moscow. They are: Donald D. Smith of Marstons Mills, Nicholas and Ellen Harmansky of West Barnstable, Edwin and Margaaret Sargent of Ca-taunet, and Brian O'Hearn of Centerville. I

extend to them my best wishes for a safe journey and successful race, and commend them for their efforts to address the problem of world hunger.

HUNTERS AND FISHING MEN
AND WOMEN PUT THEIR
MONEY WHERE THEIR
MOUTHS ARE—PROMOTING
CONSERVATION TO THE TUNE
OF \$661 MILLION LAST YEAR.

HON. DON YOUNG

OF ALASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 9, 1988

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, I have always felt that the men and women who hunt and fish and trap are the real environmentalists. They pursue their hobby throughout this great Nation and understand that conservation means wise use of the resources. They are responsible for the vast proportion of wildlife management programs in this Nation, because they put their money where their mouths are—they buy licenses and permits and comply with the laws designed by wildlife managers which promote healthy populations of fish and game. Recently, the Department of Interior released a list of the moneys raised on a State-by-State basis which details this enormous contribution by these good Americans to the wildlife we all enjoy. I ask that the list, and the accompanying release be placed in the RECORD, and I salute these, the real environmentalists of this land.

FISHING AND HUNTING LICENSE SALES STABLE,
REVENUE INCREASES ACCORDING TO LATEST
SALES FIGURES

Revenue from hunting and fishing license sales increased about 5 percent in 1987, while fishing and hunting activity in the United States remained about the same as the previous year, according to the latest license sales figures released today by U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service Director Frank Dunkle.

A total of 15,819,366 people bought hunting licenses in fiscal year 1987, compared with 15,773,190 during fiscal year 1986. Fishing license purchasers numbered 30,350,321 in fiscal year 1987 compared with 30,359,462 in 1986. Money spent on licenses and associated permits, tags, and stamps in 1987 reached an overall total of \$661 million compared with the previous total of \$624 million in 1986.

Money from the sale of fishing and hunting licenses, permits, tags, and stamps is used to fund State fish and wildlife programs. License sales figures are compiled annually by the Service's Federal Aid Division from figures submitted by State fish and wildlife agencies. State funding through the Federal Aid in Wildlife Restoration and the Federal Aid in Sport Fish Restoration programs, both administered by the Service, is determined in part by the number of paid fishing and hunting license holders in each State.

License sales figures tend to fluctuate from year to year due to a number of reasons, such as the initiation of a special permit, stamp, or tag; or new regulations governing resident vs. nonresident licenses or one day vs. seasonal licenses. For this reason, the total number of fishing licenses,

permits, tags, and stamps sold does not always reflect a trend in hunting or fishing activity, but could be attributed to a change in State license requirements.

Trends in participation are best measured by comparison of the numbers of paid license holders (first column on table attached) from year to year. These figures

provide a general estimate of fishing and hunting activity in each State. However, the figures do not necessarily reflect the actual number of hunters and anglers in the country because some States offer license exemptions to people in special circumstances, such as those who are over or under a certain age, handicapped, or who hunt or fish

on their own land. Also, some States sponsor special "free" hunting and fishing days, and those who hunt or fish in more than one State are counted more than once.

A State-by-State breakdown of 1987 hunting and fishing license sales figures is attached.

NUMBER OF PAID FISHING LICENSE HOLDERS, LICENSE SALES, AND COST TO FISHERMEN FISCAL YEAR 1987

State	Paid fishing license holders ¹	Resident fishing licenses, tags permits and stamps	Nonresident fishing licenses tags, permits and stamps ²	Total fishing licenses, tags, permits and stamps ³	Gross cost to fishermen
Alabama	616,313	531,517	113,041	644,558	\$5,049,783
Alaska	297,711	181,721	140,773	322,494	4,028,812
Arizona	497,237	460,365	157,976	618,341	5,751,617
Arkansas	641,564	626,464	141,068	767,532	6,900,160
California	2,341,565	3,355,307	69,350	3,424,657	39,230,069
Colorado	747,235	605,266	325,248	930,514	8,273,884
Connecticut	205,954	198,934	7,020	205,954	1,538,396
Delaware	19,762	20,668	4,066	24,734	199,285
Florida	809,491	629,225	189,491	818,716	7,058,305
Georgia	739,275	873,224	57,901	931,125	4,735,117
Hawaii	8,377	8,377	265	8,642	27,045
Idaho	430,479	322,663	158,063	480,726	4,718,749
Illinois	816,076	912,043	39,459	951,502	5,488,416
Indiana	660,001	624,566	111,870	736,436	4,562,192
Iowa	423,668	417,966	38,705	456,671	3,649,082
Kansas	305,352	261,793	52,367	314,160	3,844,692
Kentucky	641,217	539,244	140,287	573,531	5,370,072
Louisiana	570,844	748,917	42,580	791,497	2,982,308
Maine	251,299	181,207	86,824	268,031	4,557,348
Maryland	385,749	406,079	40,581	446,660	3,169,551
Massachusetts	204,923	214,680	8,149	222,829	2,357,851
Michigan	1,566,589	1,230,418	355,056	1,585,474	12,976,305
Minnesota	1,467,430	1,017,133	258,506	1,275,639	15,880,348
Mississippi	480,412	394,001	86,411	480,412	3,170,428
Missouri	1,039,988	1,586,522	133,516	1,720,038	7,837,387
Montana	379,382	317,321	279,662	596,983	6,219,097
Nebraska	260,378	264,955	45,803	310,758	2,716,172
Nevada	170,402	202,803	58,258	261,061	2,434,839
New Hampshire	167,633	112,183	56,114	168,297	2,819,670
New Jersey	237,851	365,942	11,178	377,120	3,692,565
New Mexico	264,456	194,052	80,406	274,458	3,302,769
New York	1,122,431	956,856	234,360	1,191,216	9,942,707
North Carolina	456,179	429,462	54,595	484,057	5,635,000
North Dakota	161,610	169,662	18,196	187,858	1,009,138
Ohio	1,194,404	1,084,930	112,745	1,197,675	8,716,201
Oklahoma	587,900	488,072	89,065	577,137	7,241,146
Oregon	762,138	980,829	224,807	1,205,636	10,974,145
Pennsylvania	1,127,284	1,056,898	70,386	1,127,284	12,934,672
Rhode Island	41,336	36,894	6,195	43,089	350,935
South Carolina	372,604	368,096	50,209	418,305	4,400,673
South Dakota	193,283	248,183	53,582	301,765	1,711,899
Tennessee	768,426	772,627	185,212	957,839	5,649,815
Texas	1,878,278	2,373,007	94,411	2,467,418	16,564,432
Utah	394,423	276,765	163,240	440,005	5,925,745
Vermont	105,230	102,353	58,698	161,051	1,476,236
Virginia	622,641	746,458	85,156	831,614	4,629,157
Washington	846,944	1,070,209	134,463	1,204,672	12,108,199
West Virginia	283,436	509,766	53,632	563,398	2,966,941
Wisconsin	1,535,247	1,344,590	404,492	1,749,082	14,950,915
Wyoming	247,913	120,838	167,184	288,022	3,542,291
Totals ³	30,350,321	35,999,051	5,550,622	41,549,673	315,272,561

¹ A paid license holder is one individual regardless of the number of licenses he may purchase. Data certified by State Fish and Game Departments.

² Period covered not identical to period covered by certification of all States.

³ Persons who fished in more than one State are counted in each State where they fished.

NUMBER OF PAID HUNTING LICENSE HOLDERS, LICENSE SALES, AND COST TO HUNTERS, FISCAL YEAR 1987

State	Paid hunting license holders ¹	Resident hunting licenses, tags permits and stamps	Nonresident hunting licenses, tags permits and stamps ²	Total hunting licenses, tags, permits and stamps ³	Gross cost to hunters
Alabama	293,436	312,369	33,098	345,467	\$4,739,128
Alaska	84,717	170,637	30,004	200,641	4,856,785
Arizona	188,211	375,127	20,760	395,887	6,311,052
Arkansas	320,410	486,106	25,855	511,961	5,795,950
California	463,074	970,606	3,601	974,207	12,858,220
Colorado	315,434	438,793	121,363	560,156	24,851,216
Connecticut	85,663	83,595	2,068	85,663	557,137
Delaware	27,698	36,559	7,918	44,477	606,907
Florida	234,954	458,990	3,109	462,099	4,369,377
Georgia	414,456	947,648	38,187	985,835	5,885,671
Hawaii	12,061	12,117	407	12,524	89,481
Idaho	247,635	515,657	60,547	576,204	10,316,917
Illinois	320,682	559,074	10,325	569,399	4,984,339
Indiana	291,876	492,847	9,572	502,419	3,686,758
Iowa	243,279	168,817	55,436	267,532	6,411,927
Kansas	210,068	260,247	31,414	291,661	5,339,481
Kentucky	323,418	502,610	14,673	517,283	5,077,279
Louisiana	326,377	530,692	8,373	539,065	5,780,459
Maine	203,376	202,680	36,682	239,362	5,068,401
Maryland	176,125	361,315	60,631	421,946	3,240,211
Massachusetts	96,695	179,948	2,859	182,807	1,344,351
Michigan	926,328	1,445,837	21,777	1,467,614	14,235,557

NUMBER OF PAID HUNTING LICENSE HOLDERS, LICENSE SALES, AND COST TO HUNTERS, FISCAL YEAR 1987—Continued

State	Paid hunting license holders ¹	Resident hunting licenses, tags, permits and stamps	Nonresident hunting licenses, tags, permits and stamps	Total hunting license, tags, permits and stamps ²	Gross cost to hunters
Minnesota.....	509,238	978,544	8,726	987,270	12,598,395
Mississippi.....	294,808	263,045	31,763	294,808	3,588,315
Missouri.....	496,618	957,680	30,398	988,078	7,684,487
Montana.....	262,802	801,172	192,612	993,784	9,895,034
Nebraska.....	157,071	312,364	35,992	348,356	4,282,349
Nevada.....	59,737	112,927	8,584	121,511	2,228,385
New Hampshire.....	94,937	108,842	17,823	126,665	2,288,228
New Jersey.....	131,937	285,762	7,791	295,553	4,788,855
New Mexico.....	148,686	145,947	17,086	163,003	5,081,438
New York.....	773,283	1,288,293	60,689	1,348,982	13,094,134
North Carolina.....	327,542	416,039	13,711	429,750	4,883,228
North Dakota.....	101,591	399,418	36,277	435,695	3,160,546
Ohio.....	461,820	805,508	11,459	816,967	6,788,392
Oklahoma.....	254,920	359,350	8,729	368,079	6,010,952
Oregon.....	350,402	937,375	26,443	963,818	11,204,683
Pennsylvania.....	1,173,841	2,078,771	90,783	2,169,554	24,157,023
Rhode Island.....	18,092	18,759	2,951	21,710	193,470
South Carolina.....	177,268	229,943	29,719	259,662	4,878,253
South Dakota.....	145,541	376,582	95,082	471,664	4,645,383
Tennessee.....	603,846	916,767	15,957	932,724	7,109,952
Texas.....	1,190,075	1,416,303	20,278	1,436,581	12,710,666
Utah.....	224,096	285,379	20,624	306,003	6,553,296
Vermont.....	109,877	90,496	19,381	109,877	1,687,997
Virginia.....	477,188	852,190	77,896	930,086	6,869,977
Washington.....	267,713	657,792	4,662	662,454	10,179,114
West Virginia.....	317,404	482,280	88,178	570,458	5,601,194
Wisconsin.....	737,019	1,359,807	35,233	1,395,040	16,927,650
Wyoming.....	145,921	197,916	75,970	273,886	9,784,510
Totals ³	15,819,366	27,097,522	1,683,426	28,780,948	345,282,520

¹ A paid license holder is one individual regardless of the number of licenses he may purchase. Data certified by State Fish and Game Departments.

² Period covered not identical to period covered by certification for all States.

³ Persons who hunted in more than one State are counted in each State where they hunted.

VA PROVIDES 100,000 RESERVISTS WITH EDUCATION AID

HON. BEVERLY B. BYRON

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 9, 1988

Mrs. BYRON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to share a success story with my colleagues. The Veterans' Administration has just announced that it has provided educational assistance to more than 100,000 reservists eligible for such benefits under the Montgomery GI bill. This is a marvelous achievement. It signifies that the Montgomery GI bill is meeting our high expectations in attracting high quality individuals to our reserve forces, individuals who are interested not only in serving the Nation but in improving their own skills and education as well. I offer my congratulations to my colleague, Congressman SONNY MONTGOMERY, and ask that the announcement from the Veterans' Administration be entered into the RECORD.

VA PROVIDES 100,000 RESERVISTS WITH EDUCATION AID

The Veterans Administration has provided education benefits to more than 100,000 military reservists after the first three years of a new assistance program for National Guard and Reserve members.

VA Administrator Thomas K. Turnage noted, "The program provides up to \$5,040 to eligible reservists for 36 months of college studies. For the first time, members of the Army, Navy, Air Force, Marine and Coast Guard Reserves, and the Army and Air National Guards are now eligible for VA education benefits."

By July 1, 1988, the third anniversary of the program, the 100,000th claim for benefits had been processed.

The reserve benefits are authorized by the Montgomery GI Bill, which also provides

education benefits to veterans and active duty service members. The education program is funded by the Defense Department and administered by the VA.

VA programs have been providing educational benefits to veterans since 1944, but reservists have been eligible only since 1985, when the Montgomery GI Bill went into effect. More than 20 million Americans have received educational benefits totaling \$69.7 billion in the past 43 years.

"It has been estimated that these veterans will pay up to eight times the cost of their education in federal income taxes, or \$557.6 billion, from the added lifetime income their educations made possible," Turnage said. "And that doesn't even take into consideration the technological commercial, artistic and other improvements their educations have returned to American society."

IN MEMORY OF SHARON LANE: FIRST UNITED STATES WOMAN KILLED IN VIETNAM

HON. LANE EVANS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 9, 1988

Mr. EVANS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to pay tribute to Sharon Lane, the first United States woman killed in Vietnam. As chairman of the Vietnam-era Veterans in Congress [VVIC] and chairman of the Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations of the House Veterans' Affairs Committee, I believe it is important for us to continue to honor those who have served our country in the Vietnam War. In memory of Sharon Lane, I ask that this article be inserted into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

[From the Wilkes-Barre (PA) Times Leader, June 26, 1988]

SHARON LANE: FIRST U.S. WOMAN KILLED IN VIETNAM

(By George Esper)

SUITLAND, MD.—The Vietnam war's messengers of death are inescapable at the National Archives.

The daily journals, the annual history of the Da Nang mortuary, the certificates of death, the records of things left behind—a peace medal, a Bible, tape cassettes—are abundant in the 12 million pages of Army documents recently made public.

Together, they chronicle the heavy toll paid by the 58,156 men and women who died in Vietnam.

The Da Nang mortuary report tells of processing the remains of 5,377 Americans in 1969 and notes that the number of casualties was generally higher in March through May of each year because of regular North Vietnamese and Viet Cong offensives.

The second entry in the daily staff journal of the 74th Medical Battalion at Chu Lai on June 8, 1969, brought the dreaded knock on the door back home in Canton, Ohio, for Kay and John Lane.

"1. 0001 Journal opened.

"2. 0550 Rocket attack 312th area. Resulted in the death of a nurse.

"3. 0720 SFC Bailey called SP5 Ellafrits, 312th Evac, on the casualty report on the death of 1LT Sharon A. Lane, N2334551, 312th Evac, as a result of attack at 0550 hrs —"

While it was morning in Vietnam, it was the previous evening in the United States because Saigon time was 11 hours ahead. The Lanes heard sketchy details of the rocket attack on the evening news.

"Right after that came a knock on the door and we saw this Army car sitting in the driveway," Kay Lane, now 64, recalled in a telephone interview. "When he (the Army officer) came to the door, even before my husband got there, I said, 'Is she dead?' He said, 'Yes.'"

A piece of steel from a rocket that landed between Ward 4A and Ward 4B of the 312th Evacuation Hospital had ripped through Sharon Lane's aorta. She bled to death less than a month before her 26th birthday, the first woman killed by hostile fire in Vietnam.

Among her last letters home, she wrote on June 4, 1969, that her unit had just reached a milestone by treating its 10,000th patient since arriving in Vietnam the previous September. Then she added:

"Start 'nights' tomorrow so don't have to get up early tomorrow. Nice thought. Still very quiet around here. Haven't gotten mortared for a couple of weeks now..."

Four days later, she was dead. She was posthumously awarded the Bronze Star, the Purple Heart and the Vietnamese Gallantry Cross.

A memorial statue of the nurse stands in the courtyard of Aultman Hospital in Canton, where she went to nursing school. The hospital's Sharon Lane Women's Center is named in her honor.

Just the same, her mother said, Sharon would approve of none of this.

"She wasn't that kind of person," Kay Lane said. "She just thought she was a nobody, you know, just an ordinary person, and everybody tries to make a hero out of her now."

PRESS CONFERENCE ON ANTI-SEMITISM IN THE SOVIET UNION

HON. TED WEISS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 9, 1988

Mr. WEISS. Mr. Speaker, the following statement concerning anti-Semitism in the Soviet Union is one which I issued for distribution at a press conference held today on the steps of the Capitol. I insert it in its entirety in the RECORD:

PRESS CONFERENCE ON ANTI-SEMITISM IN THE SOVIET UNION

Let me begin by thanking my colleagues and friends with the Congressional Human Rights Caucus, Tom Lantos, John Porter, Jim Scheuer, and Jack Buechner, as well as the Anti-Defamation League, the National Conference on Soviet Jewry, and the Union of Councils for Soviet Jewry, for their hard work and dedication to this important cause. Let me also extend a special welcome to Lev Shapiro, who has experienced personally the ugliness of anti-Semitism.

We are here today to send an important message to Mikhail Gorbachev. Mr. Gorbachev, there is no such thing as selective Glasnost—it must apply to people of every race, creed, color and religion.

We have heard of the new openness of Soviet society. We have heard of the Perestroika—the restructuring. We have heard of the willingness to abide by the human rights agreements that Soviet Union voluntarily signed, including the Helsinki Final Act and the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. These documents talk of the rights of freedom of conscience, freedom to practice religion, and freedom to live in the country of one's choice.

But, Mr. Gorbachev, we have also heard the disturbing accounts of rampant anti-Semitism in the Soviet Union: the refusenik demonstrations crushed by the KGB; the

Pamyat demonstrations for which special halls are reserved and which are ignored by the KGB; the leaflets advocating "Death to the Jews" which are plastered around Moscow; the overturning of Jewish tombstones in Soviet graveyards; the program atmosphere and the threats of violence which pervade Jewish communities in the Soviet Union; and the arbitrariness with which Soviet law is applied to Jews.

The questions remain: when will we hear Mr. Gorbachev act or speak out against this anti-Semitism? Where do Soviet Jews go to apply for the rights and freedoms to which they are entitled? When will we see a public commitment toward religious freedom, or toward free emigration, or against religious violence. Mr. Gorbachev, where do Soviet Jews go to apply for Glasnost?

We call upon the leadership of the Soviet Union today to show us their commitment, to publicly denounce anti-Semitism, and to truly guarantee religious freedom and free emigration for all their citizens, regardless of religion. Mr. Gorbachev, the world awaits your response.

THIS IS A WAR

HON. MICHAEL G. OXLEY

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 9, 1988

Mr. OXLEY. Mr. Speaker, last night we learned of the attempted assassination of Secretary of State George P. Shultz in La Paz, Bolivia. An explosive device was set off on the roadside along which the Secretary of State's motorcade was traveling. Luckily, no one was hurt, yet the explosion was strong enough to damage the automobiles in the motorcade. By the best accounts of the incident so far, it appears that Bolivian drug kingpins may be responsible for this action.

This assassination attempt further demonstrates the magnitude of the problem and dangers that drug kingpins pose to our society and to U.S. citizens. Not only do drug kingpins transport illegal narcotics into our country to poison our children, not only do they torture and murder U.S. Drug Enforcement Administration agents, they now try to murder our Secretary of State. I fully agree with Secretary Shultz when he stated after the incident that the attack was "antidemocratic and anticivilized."

As we now enter into consideration of the Omnibus Drug Initiative Act of 1988, I find it ironic that, given these actions, there are still Members of this body that believe the death penalty is too severe a punishment for drug kingpins. Mr. Speaker, this is a war. Drug kingpins pose a direct threat to our society and to our citizens. We need a tough, effective deterrent to help stop the deadly actions of drug kingpins. I submit to my colleagues that the death penalty for drug kingpins is reasonable and appropriate, and it is a necessary tool to fight the war on drugs.

BOLIVIAN DRUG TRAFFICKERS BOMB SECRETARY SHULTZ' MOTORCADE

HON. BENJAMIN A. GILMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 9, 1988

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, the international drug traffickers have ruthlessly struck again. While traveling from Bolivia's El Alto Airport to La Paz, Secretary of State George Shultz's motorcade was bombed by Bolivian drug traffickers. Fortunately, no one was injured, but, several of the cars in the motorcade were damaged, including the vehicle carrying the Secretary's wife, Helena.

Mr. Speaker, this unfortunate incident illustrates once again, that all nations of the international community are vulnerable and interdependent. Nations everywhere must band together to combat these international drug traffickers. Global and regional drug strategies must be formulated. Resources, funds, equipment, and personnel must be pooled in order to conduct an effective war on this insidious menace that is undermining the political, social, and economic institutions of nations throughout the world and that is jeopardizing the health of citizens from every nation.

Mr. Speaker, I also want to take this opportunity to commend the Government of Bolivia, President Victor Paz Estenssoro, and the people of Bolivia for their courage in recently enacting the Bolivian antidrug law, for their efforts to eradicate the illicit production of coca in their nation, and for their arrest of drug kingpin, Roberto Suarez.

May their efforts result in stamping out the insidious evil of narcotics which is eroding their institutions. S110

SUPPORT FOR THE CONTRAS IS NOT THE ANSWER

HON. STEPHEN L. NEAL

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 9, 1988

Mr. NEAL. Mr. Speaker, a recent editorial in the Charlotte Observer succinctly points us in the right direction as we continue considering our policy in Nicaragua.

The Reagan administration's support of the Contra forces has strengthened, not weakened, the Sandinista government, has wasted hundreds of millions of dollars and has increased bloodshed and turmoil in Nicaragua. The administration's policy has been a complete and costly failure.

We should, without illusion about the Sandinistas, support democracy, and peace in Central America.

Mr. Speaker, I ask that this excellent editorial from the Charlotte Observer of July 19, 1988, be included in the RECORD at this point. The editorial follows:

[From the Charlotte Observer, July 19, 1988]

**REPRESSION IN NICARAGUA
CONTRAS STILL AREN'T THE BEST OPTION FOR
WASHINGTON**

Nicaragua's Sandinistas have shown, once again, the hollowness of their commitment to the democratization they promised as part of the Central American peace settlement. But that ought not provoke Washington to return to a hopeless and unsustainable policy of depending primarily on the contras.

There ought to be few illusions left about the Sandinistas. Time and again they have shown that their heart belongs to Lenin and Castro. Their latest outbreak of repression is completely in character: beating and tear-gassing demonstrators, jailing opponents, shutting down *La Prensa* (for 15 days) and the Catholic radio, and expelling American diplomats. If the people of Nicaragua are to enjoy democracy, it will have to be wrested from the Sandinistas. And Washington must be concerned about the dangers posed to American interests and hemispheric peace by the Sandinistas' ambitions and the continuing flow of Soviet weapons.

But renewing the flow of American weapons to the contras is not the best option, and certainly ought not be the first option. The key to ending Soviet-bloc support for the Sandinistas—and thus reducing their potential to threaten their neighbors—is U.S.-Soviet negotiations. Arming the contras, by contrast, does nothing to decrease the flow of Soviet aid, and may have the opposite effect.

Continuing the war threatens the regional peace that is essential to any hope of building prosperity and real democracy in Central America. And so long as the fighting continues, so does the risk of direct American involvement. Like the Sandinistas, the civil war is devastating to the Nicaraguan people, threatening to their neighbors and harmful to American interests.

Instead of first encouraging renewed military aid to the contras, the administration ought to seize a better opportunity. Both the Senate and the House have voted overwhelmingly to condemn the Sandinistas' latest outburst of repression. Democrat Michael Dukakis has selected contra supporter Lloyd Bentsen for his running mate. Perhaps there is, finally, a chance to build an American and regional consensus that can be sustained beyond the rapidly approaching end of the Reagan administration—a consensus that rejects any more illusions about the Sandinistas or the chances for a contra victory. The American priority ought to be on a diplomatic offensive—in the region and the world.

**DEPARTMENT OF LABOR BELIEVES
VOLUNTEER FIREMEN SHOULD BE PAID FOR WEARING
BEEPER**

HON. DENNY SMITH

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 9, 1988

Mr. DENNY SMITH. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of our Nation's fire services. Recently, these men and women who protect our homes and towns from fire have come under the scrutiny of the U.S. Department of Labor.

Fire departments are expected to provide their communities with efficient and effective fire protection. But Mr. Speaker, owing to new and seemingly random audits of fire departments by the Department of Labor, additional and often excessive amounts of money are demanded under the Fair Labor Standards Act, or FLSA.

Two fire departments in my congressional district, Marion County Fire District No. 1, and Polk County Fire District No. 1, have been asked to pay thousands of dollars in back wages to volunteers. Think about that for a moment—wages to volunteers.

You see, the Department of Labor believes that a volunteer should be paid for wearing a beeper. Even if that volunteer works as a store manager or a company official, even if the volunteer is at home with the family, having dinner or watching television, the Department of Labor wants the volunteer department to pay that individual \$3.35 an hour.

Worse yet, the time that the Department of Labor calls "on call time" can vary from department to department. Some districts want volunteers to answer a fire call within 3 or 4 minutes, others would like a response around 10 minutes from the alarm. The Department of Labor, however, seems to have imposed different "on call time" limits for which they would like a firefighter to be paid.

But the departments that have asked for a set "on call time" from the Department of Labor, or who have asked for a definition of "volunteer" so that they will know who they're supposed to pay under the Fair Labor Standards Act, have received a frightening answer.

The answer is that the Department of Labor determines FLSA infractions on a case-by-case basis.

That determination leaves our volunteer departments high and dry when it comes to finding solutions to hiring, setting beeper assignments, figuring "on call time," and so forth. How are our volunteer fire departments supposed to know what to do.

This fluid set of standards alarms me, Mr. Speaker. It alarms the people who rely on volunteer departments because those departments are now incurring expenses—expenses to pay volunteers—that they never expected. Tiny local taxes can't offset the back pay that the Department of Labor wants from these local departments, and the protection of our homes and cities is hanging in the balance. Labor is trying to hook our departments into unjust payments with a ladder of surprise regulations.

The Oregon Fire Chiefs' Association passed a resolution this summer calling for solid, clear, written standards by the Department of Labor so that our fire departments can plan their volunteers, beepers, and time requirements to avoid additional and incapacitating costs.

Setting guidelines on the FLSA is not a lot to ask for, Mr. Speaker. I am convinced that our volunteer firefighters, as well as Congress, would be best served by having the Department of Labor clarify and print the regulations that they would like our fire districts to follow. Random chance isn't good enough when it comes to planning a budget for a local fire service. Fair labor standards should be obvi-

ous and understandable before they're called "fair".

Today I have introduced a resolution which requests the Secretary of Labor to define and publish clear standards for the application of FLSA to volunteer departments.

The intent of this bill, Mr. Speaker, is an intent which I am sure that we all share—allowing volunteer fire departments to provide the best fire prevention service possible. I am urging my distinguished colleagues to support this legislation, and in doing so, to support the future of almost 1 million volunteer firefighters and the communities that they serve.

**SKELLY WRIGHT: A GREAT AND
COURAGEOUS JURIST**

HON. JOHN CONYERS, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 9, 1988

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, one of the greatest and most courageous jurists to ever sit on our Federal courts passed away this past Saturday at the age of 77.

J. Skelly Wright was a bridge from the old South to the new South. A native of Louisiana, he led his neighbors and fellow citizens out of the era of Jim Crow and segregation and into a new society freed of the scourge of overt racism.

But it was not only in the area of race relations that Judge Wright demonstrated his courage and scholarship and his unwavering commitment to humane values. He had an abiding concern for the rights of the individual caught up in conflict with the power and authority of governmental bureaucracy.

Judge Wright, who was once the youngest person ever appointed to a Federal judgeship, became a recognized hero of the nascent civil rights movement in 1960, when he dared to order the integration of the public school system in his native New Orleans. During his tenure on the U.S. District Court in Louisiana, he also desegregated the professional schools of Louisiana State University and the public buses in New Orleans, opened the city's parks to blacks, restored the names of hundreds of blacks who had been purged from the voting lists and upheld interracial sporting events.

Not all of his fellow citizens celebrated his courageous decisions at a time when the Eisenhower administration was giving aid and comfort to the old order, which was attempting to resist the commands of the U.S. Supreme Court to dismantle the system of segregation and unequal education that existed throughout the South and in much of the rest of the country as well.

As a result of his rulings, Judge Wright was threatened, hanged in effigy and ostracized by his former friends, who according to a New York Times profile on November 16, 1960, called him a traitor to his class. U.S. marshals were assigned to guard him after crosses were burned on the lawn of his home. Indeed, Judge Wright was the target of so many threats against his life and well-being that soon after his election, President John F. Kennedy reassigned him to the U.S. Court of Ap-

peals in the District of Columbia, which moved him out of the direct line of hostile fire.

Judge Wright did not find the District that much more hospitable to his egalitarian view of the Constitution. He unleashed a new firestorm in 1967, when he ruled that the de facto segregation of the D.C. schools also violated the U.S. Constitution.

His 25 years on the court of appeals have been marked by a steady flow of opinions attempting to protect and extend the rights of the individual. As described in a Washington Post opinion piece by Attorney Ronald Goldfarb on Monday, "He authored a stream of civil liberties-sided cases in the area of criminal justice, championed the claims of poor people for equal justice, and was a constant and articulate defender of press rights."

At least one law school, Rutgers, in Newark, NJ, annually awards a J. Skelly Wright prize to the member of its graduating class who contributed the most to the cause of civil rights and civil liberties during his or her law school career.

I attach hereto the entire Op Ed piece by Attorney Goldfarb, which is a fitting tribute to this very special American jurist.

[From the Washington Post, Aug. 8, 1988]

'WE ARE, ALL OF US, FREE-BORN AMERICANS'

(By Ronald Goldfarb)

It is odd that students at places like Harvard Law School wear Skelly Wright T-shirts. A shy and simple man, whose modesty belied his judicial activism and personal toughness, Wright was not a product of the social or legal elite which came to admire him so. He came from a poor Catholic New Orleans family, worked his way through Loyola University Law School at night, taught high school during the Depression, got his first job through a political connection, and was a conventional tough prosecutor until World War II, when he served in the Coast Guard in England. There he met his wife Helen (to the end he called her "Shugah").

After the war he practiced law in Washington alone and briefly with two other lawyers. His most notable case was a famous capital punishment appeal, which he lost in the U.S. Supreme Court. In 1947, he filled an opening in the U.S. attorney's office in New Orleans. Truman's surprise election a year later extended Wright's prosecutor's job. In 1949, at 38, he was appointed a federal trial judge.

There was no reason to suspect from such a background that Skelly Wright would become the extraordinary and controversial champion of the Bill of Rights, and particularly of civil rights, that he did, or to think, judging by his gentle and modest personal life style, that he would become so ardent and courageous an activist on behalf of civil rights and civil liberties. Few judges in American history will leave bigger footprints on this terrain.

The case—or series of cases over several years—that catapulted Skelly Wright into national prominence was *Bush v. Orleans Parish Schools*, involving the desegregation of New Orleans public schools in the aftermath of *Brown v. Board of Education*. It was a time when civil rights were not in fashion and blacks had few allies in government. Wright adamantly enforced *Brown*, and as a result he incurred the wrath of his community. He was ostracized viciously, hanged in effigy and made a social pariah. Earlier he had ordered the desegregation of

Louisiana State University law school; indeed between 1952 and 1962—early days in the civil rights struggle in America—Wright issued 41 decisions on racial integration. In the words of Jack Bass, a journalist who studied southern judges, Skelly Wright, very much alone, "broke the back of the states' efforts at massive resistance . . . and upheld federal supremacy under the Constitution."

Wright's actions took great courage at that time and in that place. A few years ago, during a television interview, I asked him to explain what had prompted him to act so bravely and nobly. He was embarrassed by that assessment, saw himself as having done the only thing that could have been done, and felt deserving of no special credit for his judicial integrity. But he did recall an incident that moved him and still haunted him decades later as we spoke. When he was U.S. attorney in New Orleans, he told me, his office was across the street from the Home for the Blind. One Christmas Eve he was looking out his window and noticed a bus unloading a group of blind Negroes who were led by a white person to the entrance for blacks at the rear of the building. "They couldn't even see," he remembered, staring into the distant past with eyes that filled as he spoke, "yet they made them walk into separate doors. That sight still affects me."

When President Kennedy took office Wright was promoted from the U.S. District Court in New Orleans, where he had sat for 13 years, to the U.S. Court of Appeals in Washington, where he was to serve for 25 more years, the last of them as chief judge. It was speculated that Wright would replace his friend and fellow southerner on the Supreme Court, but presidential politics precluded such a move. Many of his corps of former law clerks went on to Supreme Court clerkships, and many of them are law professors now. A prolific flow of law review articles and speeches provided Wright with a national stage and made him far more influential than most lower court judges.

In Washington, Wright's involvement, with controversial cases, particularly civil rights cases, continued. He was the author of the famous *Hobson* decision seeking to end de facto segregation in the Washington schools. He authored a stream of civil liberties-sided cases in the area of criminal justice, championed the claims of poor people for equal justice, and was a constant and articulate defender of press rights. The body of Wright writings—more than 1,000 judicial opinions and scores of law review articles—is vast and influential. But his personal example—especially in the South when it was hard and risky to act during those early days of the civil rights revolution—was his greatest achievement.

The late law professor Arthur Miller, a Wright biographer, considered Skelly Wright a result-oriented, plain-speaking judge who always viewed the Constitution not as a lawyer's document "but as a charter for the achievement of social justice." No better epitaph could be devised for Wright than his own touching words written three decades ago at the time of the integration of New Orleans' public schools. He wrote the words on the back of a Mardi Gras brochure, but they are etched now on a family heirloom. The words capture the man's elegance and humanity:

"The problem of changing a people's mores, particularly those with an emotional overlay, is not to be taken lightly. It is a problem which will require the utmost patience, understanding, generosity and for-

bearance from all of us of whatever race. But the magnitude of the problem may not nullify the principle. And that principle is that we are, all of us, free-born Americans with a right to make our way unfettered by sanctions imposed by man because of the work of God."

MASSACHUSETTS RESPONDS TO THE DRUG CRISIS

HON. GERRY E. STUDDS

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 9, 1988

Mr. STUDDS. Mr. Speaker, in Massachusetts, as in many other States, the incidence of AIDS among intravenous drug users is rising dramatically. Drug users play a significant role in the AIDS epidemic because they are a transmission link with adult and pediatric populations. Success in slowing the spread of AIDS will therefore depend, to a large extent, on progress in curing drug users of their addiction.

The Commonwealth of Massachusetts, recognizing this fact, has initiated and funded a far-reaching program whose goal is to offer treatment to many more drug addicts. I bring to the attention of my colleagues the following editorial from the August 3 Boston Globe, which describes the State's response to this tragic national problem.

A DRUG-ADDICTION CHALLENGE

Governor Dukakis deserves great credit for initiating—and funding—the most ambitious program in the nation aimed at getting drug addicts under treatment to cure their addiction and prevent AIDS. This step also could lead to placing the treatment of addiction in the mainstream of medical care.

Massachusetts has 40,000 needle-using drug abusers. By adding \$2.6 million for methadone-treatment programs, plus \$3.1 million to allow Medicaid—for the first time—to pay for treatment, the state will be able to offer help to about half of these drug abusers through existing clinics and live-in centers.

The Medicaid funds should result in treatment being offered by private hospitals. Twenty years ago, Medicaid payment for impoverished patients paved the way for their care at virtually all hospitals—not just in back wards at municipal and teaching hospitals.

For decades, treatment for drug addicts has been cruelly limited—by lack of funds and by the criminalizing of drug addiction. Of the nation's 1.4 million needle-using addicts, treatment has never been available to more than one in 10.

The spread of AIDS among drug addicts adds urgency. The disease is transmitted by contact with AIDS-contaminated blood when an infected addict shares a needle. AIDS among addicts is complicated by the passage of the disease to their sex partners and, during pregnancy, to their children.

In Massachusetts, treatment capacity was limited to 7,800 openings until 1986. Capacity rose to 12,000 in 1987, when Dukakis obtained better funding; it now will increase to 19,500.

Delay in expanding the programs has permitted AIDS to spread widely among the nation's needle-using addicts; in Massachu-

setts, 40 percent are now said to be AIDS-infected.

With the grants, most of the state's 21 drug-treatment centers will be brought to capacity. Medicaid funds will remove the financial obstacles to creating more centers.

Although methadone treatment to wean addicts off illicit drugs has a substantial failure rate, part of the reason may be conditions under which it is provided. Financial and societal support for treatment centers—and for research into better modes of treatment—has been lacking.

Guaranteed funding for drug treatment may make a new start possible. Massachusetts' hospitals should review their medical responsibility and take up the challenge of drug addiction.

IN SUPPORT OF HOUSE RESOLUTION 514 IN SUPPORT OF A PEACEFUL SETTLEMENT OF THE CYPRUS DISPUTE

SPEECH OF

HON. EDWARD F. FEIGHAN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 8, 1988

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the resolution and I want to commend the sponsors and the chairman of our committee for acting swiftly to bring this resolution to the floor. Last week, many Members of the House had the opportunity to meet with the President of Cyprus, George Vassiliou, and hear him outline his desire to seek a peaceful, negotiated settlement to the Cyprus dispute. Later this month, he will meet with the Turkish-Cypriot leader, Rauf Denktash, to begin a new dialog designed to make that desire a reality.

This meeting comes at an opportune moment. Earlier this year, we witnessed the initiation of a high-level dialog between the Prime Ministers of Greece and Turkey. This effort created a positive atmosphere that can only help to facilitate movement on the Cyprus issue. President Vassiliou's election represents an opportunity to begin a new chapter in the efforts of the UN Secretary-General to mediate this dispute.

The Secretary-General recently reported to the Security Council of the status of his good offices mission. He stated that the report came at a time of great tension and of great hope. The tension came from the spate of shooting incidents that has occurred between the two communities and between the Turkish-Cypriot side and the U.N. Peacekeeping Force. The hope stems from the possibility of breaking the diplomatic stalemate and bringing the two sides together to resume a high level dialog.

Last week's visit to Washington by the Cypriot President gave rise to President Reagan's reiteration of United States policy in support of the Secretary-General's efforts. This resolution is consistent with that policy and serves to underscore the importance that this Congress places on the Cyprus issue. I urge its immediate passage.

INTRODUCTION OF H.R. 5188 AND H.R. 5189

HON. DON YOUNG

OF ALASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 9, 1988

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. Speaker, I rise to introduce H.R. 5188 and H.R. 5189. These two bills provide the much needed second step for the Mobile Trade Fair Promotion Program that was included as part of the omnibus trade bill which the President will sign this week.

One of these bills simply allows the Secretary of Commerce to provide grants and other technical assistance to operators of export promotion vessels. The other bill simply provides grants to small businesses that wish to participate in the Mobile Trade Fair Program.

Export promotion is critical to this Nation's continued economic growth. The Mobile Trade Fair Program provides an inexpensive and effective means of showing the world what this country has to sell. The grants included in this legislation simply provide the seed money that will encourage the expansion of the Mobile Trade Fair Program.

This legislation is important to the development of new markets for U.S. made goods and I urge its favorable consideration by the House.

C.W. "BUCK" DOYLE: MONTGOMERY COUNTY HEALTH COUNSELOR ON ALCOHOL FOR 11 YEARS

HON. BEVERLY B. BYRON

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 9, 1988

Mrs. BYRON. Mr. Speaker, I wish to say a few words today about Buck Doyle, the Montgomery County Health Counselor on Alcohol from 1971 to 1982. Buck Doyle was well known in the Washington area as a loyal aide to those who suffer from the disease of alcoholism.

On Monday, July 11, Mr. Doyle was buried with full military honors in Arlington Cemetery, a victim of a stroke suffered on June 13. A former "Flying Tiger," Mr. Doyle and his four brothers enlisted in the military service on the same day during the early days of World War Two. His patriotism was only matched by the love he had for his large family and the dedication he harbored for those with alcoholism.

Mr. Speaker, the Washington Times printed an editorial on Mr. Doyle in its July 13 edition, and I would like to include it for everyone to read after my remarks. In addition, Mr. Jeremiah O'Leary, White House correspondent at the same newspaper, penned a moving obituary about Mr. Doyle on July 8. They were lifelong friends. I ask that Mr. O'Leary's words also be reproduced in entirety in the RECORD.

[From the Washington Times, July 13, 1988]

'BUCK' DOYLE

Charlton W. "Buck" Doyle, who died last week of a stroke at the age of 71, was the uncrowned leader of the Alcoholics Anonymous

subculture in the Washington area. He did more for anguished alcoholics in the 34 years since his own recovery from alcoholism than all the clinics, professors, psychologists and social programs combined between Baltimore and Richmond.

In an age in which acts of charity have been cheapened by celebrities and publicity seekers, Buck wrestled directly with the glamourless realities of alcoholism. He served day and night on what he called the "vomit line," helping desperate, demon-riddled drunks fight to survive. He specialized in the tough business of making what Alcoholics Anonymous refers to as "12th Step" calls, in which he and his wife Dolly answered cries for help at all times.

Having been a drunk, Buck wasn't one to coddle those in need. He combined the toughness of a Parris Island drill sergeant with the kindness of a family uncle. He heeded when necessary, pushed, hugged, harangued, humored—did whatever necessary to help save the anonymous souls who came to him seeking help.

Buck understood that alcoholism was as much a disease of the soul as of the body. His experience solidified his faith in a Catholic God and inspired him to help everyone, faithful and faithless alike, struggle to achieve full health. That quest necessarily involved more than just the alcoholic; it involved alcoholism's other victims—families, friends, the community at large. For every alcoholic Buck helped, he helped ten others in the community. His speeches to AA meetings around the area—he spoke at least three times a week—inspired and revived souls made weary by their solitary battles to remain sober.

Some people on this earth are lucky enough to find a mission that engages their passions and serves their communities. Buck's mission was thrust upon him by his own dark glimpse at the hell of alcoholism and nothingness. He grasped the enormous tragedy of alcoholism—the sheer waste of life, of joy, of love—and the stirring triumph of overcoming the disease one day at a time.

Buck Doyle helped an astonishing three out of four anonymous seekers recover permanently. He planted salvation by inspiring many of those recovered drunks to dedicate themselves to helping others. Thousands honored him at a funeral Monday. Thousands more will thrive because Buck Doyle taught others how to conquer alcohol's savage temptations through courage, strength and love.

[From the Washington Times, July 8, 1988]

C.W. 'BUCK' DOYLE, AA ACTIVIST 34 YEARS

(By Jeremiah O'Leary)

Charlton W. "Buck" Doyle, who was instrumental in saving the lives and careers of hundreds of alcoholics as a leading activist in Alcoholics Anonymous in the Washington area, died yesterday at the Hospice of Northern Virginia.

Mr. Doyle, 71, a member of an old Washington family, suffered a massive stroke June 13.

For the last 34 years, he dedicated his life to the AA program, attending more than 10,000 meetings and sponsoring hundreds of newcomers through the first stages of recovery.

Buck Doyle said he was about as anonymous as Sears Roebuck.

In the belief that suffering alcoholics need to know how to find people who can help them gain sobriety, he always an-

nounced his full name in an organization that zealously protects the identity of members.

He played a major role in rescuing hundreds of men and women, from both mansions and skid row. His sponsorship of drunks who no longer drink included members of Congress, lawyers, nuclear submarine commanders, airline pilots, priests, house painters, journalists, laborers, surgeons, housewives and four-star admirals.

Born in Georgetown, he graduated from St. Paul's Catholic School and attended old Columbus University Law School until the country entered World War II. He and his four brothers signed up for the armed service on the same day.

As a member of the Army Air Forces, he was a bombardier-navigator who trained in B-25s. His fighting unit of the 14th Air Force operated out of central China.

He flew 38 missions against the Japanese. In July of 1944, after he and the crew had to bail out, it was 11 days before he was rescued by Chinese guerrillas.

He was a salesman for Remington Rand Corp. in Washington until 1971, when he became Montgomery County Health Counselor on Alcohol. He retired in 1982.

Mr. Doyle joined AA early in 1954 and soon became one of the area's most active speakers and volunteers in "Twelfth Step," which sends out one or two recovered alcoholics—at any hour of the day or night—when a call for help comes from anyone suffering from alcoholism.

His technique with newcomers to the program was a blend of Marine Corps sergeant and kindly uncle. His rule was that newcomers had to attend meetings every night for six weeks, and Mr. Doyle always went with them.

There were 70 AA meetings in the Washington area when he joined. Today, there are 1,100 meetings every week.

He is survived by his wife, Dorothy "Dolly" Crombie Doyle; three daughters, Donna Pappalardo of Eastchester, N.Y.; Kathleen Gavri of Washington and Shannon Marder of Marquette, Mich.; two brothers, Phalam of Bethesda and John Doyle of Rockville; three sisters, Adrienne Smith of Washington, Lorraine Johnson of Denver and Margaret Giebel of Bethesda; and five grand children.

A funeral Mass will be said at 9:30 a.m. Monday at St. Ann's Catholic Church in Arlington, with burial in Arlington National Cemetery. The family suggests that expressions of sympathy be in the form of contributions to the Woodlawn Hospice of Northern Virginia in Arlington.

IN MEMORY OF SAMUEL LEROY MENDEL: THE NATION'S OLDEST VETERAN

HON. LANE EVANS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 9, 1988

Mr. EVANS. Mr. Speaker, it was with much sadness that I learned of the death of Samuel Leroy Mendel who was the oldest American veteran and one of two surviving veterans of the Spanish-American War era. Mr. Mendel was a resident of Galva, IL.

Mr. Mendel will be remembered best for his charity work in Galva, while in his eighties he was a youth-league baseball coach. In addition,

he had a gardening column in the local newspaper, the Galva News, and also served as commander in chief of the Spanish-American War Veterans Association.

Although Mr. Mendel, a native of Ft. Worth, was first inspired to enlist by the sinking of the U.S. battleship *Maine* on June 23, 1898, in Havana Harbor in Cuba, he was only 14 at the time. It was not until he became 17 in 1901 that he was actually able to enlist in the U.S. Army.

At that time, he had hoped to be able to join in the fighting in Guam, Puerto Rico, and the Philippines. However, instead of being able to join in the field of battle, Mr. Mendel spent his 3-year military career on the athletic fields at Fort Sam Houston. He played football, was a track champion in the 100 yard dash, the 440 and high hurdle. He became the Fort's best "monkey drill" man, swinging from one side to the other from the saddle of a running horse. In 1902, Mr. Mendel was cited as the best athlete in the U.S. Army.

I want to extend my deepest sympathy to his son, Robert L. Mendel, and daughter, Fern Varley.

DUKAKIS' \$187 BILLION PLATFORM

HON. CARL D. PURSELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 9, 1988

Mr. PURSELL. Mr. Speaker, yesterday the following article by our colleague, Representative HARRIS W. FAWELL, appeared in the Wall Street Journal.

I would like to take this opportunity to share his interesting insight with those who may not have seen it.

[From the Wall Street Journal, Aug. 8, 1988]

DUKAKIS' \$187 BILLION PLATFORM

(By Harris W. Fawell)

"It's time to ask why it is that we have run up more debt in this country." That's the question Michael Dukakis put to the Democratic convention in his acceptance speech last month.

We don't have to look very far to find the answer. In the same speech, Mr. Dukakis promised more money for students, farmers, teachers, blue-collar workers, workers on minimum wage, infants, the elderly, parents, families, the homeless, welfare recipients, universities, laboratories, urban America, rural America, small towns, big towns, factories, neighborhoods, communities, the war on drugs, the war on AIDS, the war on hunger, and the war on pollution—all the while promising to maintain a strong military.

In total, Mr. Dukakis and the Democratic Party platform made at least 16 promises requiring new spending. I'm not saying these promises are necessarily bad. I'm saying a responsible leader would tell Americans just what the price tag is.

And so I dusted off my budget books to see how much we're already spending on these 16 programs and how much spending has increased during the Reagan years. Then I tried to figure out the cost of implementing Mr. Dukakis's initiatives.

According to my calculations the 16 programs will cost at least \$37 billion more per

year in federal spending, at least \$185 billion more over the next five years. I say "at least" because I used the most conservative cost estimates from the Congressional Budget Office. If you add new spending by businesses that Democrats would mandate, the total reaches \$64 billion a year and \$320 billion over five years.

The Democrats disguise the cost of their promises by being vague. But the costs aren't hard to discern; most of these proposals have been kicking around Congress for years. Some examples:

The Democrats' platform promises "that all Americans should enjoy access to affordable, comprehensive health services . . . from pre-natal care . . . to Medicare." Translation: Rep. Claude Pepper's \$28 billion long-term health-care legislation.

It also suggests support for legislation by Sen. Edward Kennedy and Rep. Henry Waxman that would require employers to provide health insurance for all workers, including part-timers, a mandate that would cost businesses between \$27 billion and \$100 billion a year.

Mr. Dukakis says he'll give "those on welfare the chance to lift themselves out of poverty." Translation: Welfare "reform" legislation wending its way through Congress. The bill in conference would cost \$4.4 billion between 1989 and 1993.

The Democrats promise "a war we intend to win" against illegal drugs. Translation: Democrats in Congress are now pushing a one-year, \$2.6 billion increase in spending on drug programs. Never mind that during the Reagan administration spending on drug enforcement, prevention and treatment has increased to \$3.8 billion a year from \$1.1 billion.

Other big-ticket spending items on the Democrats' list: child care, \$2.5 billion; Headstart expansion, \$6.3 billion; and a significant increase in education spending, at least \$2.5 billion. This is new annual spending in addition to automatic increases that will take place under current law.

Other promises are difficult to cost out. For instance, Democrats call for "increased" spending on AIDS research and education. Yet, funding has grown to about \$1 billion this year and already is slated to increase \$350 million next year. Are the Democrats concurring with the Reagan increase, or are they proposing an even larger one?

Mr. Dukakis vows to make a college education "a right." Student loans and grants have increased to \$13.6 billion a year from \$7.2 billion during the Reagan administration. How much more are the Democrats proposing?

Through vagueness, Mr. Dukakis and the Democrats have disguised the true costs of their budget-busting proposals. Voters should challenge them to explain how they will pay for their costly promises. Will they raise taxes, cut other programs, or just let the deficit and debt soar even higher?

It's easy to promise voters all these laudable programs. It's easy to say yes. The hard part is saying no. The most difficult job elected officials deal with every day is setting priorities: deciding not which programs are good, but which good programs are absolutely essential.

In his acceptance speech, Mr. Dukakis promised "old-fashioned values like accountability and responsibility and respect for the truth." A good place to start would be with some old-fashioned accountability about how a President Dukakis would find the \$185 billion to pay for his promises.

THE NEW YORK TIMES REMINDS THE WORLD: DO NOT FORGET TIBET

HON. TOM LANTOS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 9, 1988

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, as most of my colleagues know, ever since 1959 when the Chinese occupied Tibet, Tibetans have suffered from extreme abuses of their human rights. Such violations have not diminished over the years; unrest and violence have increased markedly in the last year and now threaten to become even worse. Only recently a Chinese security official proclaimed that this "lenient" policy which has led to thousands of Tibetans being imprisoned, tortured, and in some cases, even murdered, will be replaced by a more "severe" one. What can we do to help Tibet in its plight? I wish to place in the RECORD an excellent article by A.M. Rosenthal in today's New York Times which suggests that the best hope for helping may be what we all must do for Tibet: "Remember them and speak of them." We must not let the world forget Tibet and its plight. If the Chinese continue to deprive Tibetans on their human rights, the world will view China as a brutal and cruel oppressor. China cannot earn world respect without improving its human record.

Mr. Rosenthal's insightful August 9, 1988 article follows:

[From the New York Times, Aug. 9, 1988]

THE TIBETAN FILE

(By A.M. Rosenthal)

The file has been on the desk for weeks—the clippings about arrests, beatings and killings and a copy of the historic speech to which the world paid almost no attention at all.

The file is marked "Tibet" and it keeps being put aside. And you suspect that most readers are probably not wildly interested in Tibet, so why inflict your own fascination and sorrow for that country on them, one more time? There is always something else to write about.

Anyway, what's the point? The Chinese are not going to relax their grip on Tibet and not one other country wants to do anything. So push the file aside, maybe wait for some kind of news peg to come along and justify writing about Tibet again.

Well, here's a possible news peg, will this do? Asia Watch, the human rights monitoring group, has just put out a report saying that there is severe abuse of every human right in Tibet and that torture is routine in political arrests. No country, including the United States, raises a cry, Asia Watch says.

Is that because the Chinese lock the foreign press out of Tibet? Or is it really because the U.S. has important business afoot with China, or thinks it has, and does not want to risk for a country with no significance except in culture, religion, history, freedom struggles, that kind of thing?

Here's another possible angle—a statement by Qiao Shi, the head of the Chinese security apparatus, which is a major part of a Chinese occupation policy that has partitioned the country, moved millions of Chinese into Tibet and Tibetans out, imprisoned scores of thousands of others, burned down thousands of monasteries, driven the

man who is Tibet's leader and God-figure into 30 years of exile and cost the lives of perhaps a million Tibetans.

Now, says Qiao Shi, China has decided to alter its policy in Tibet and will no longer be "lenient." From now on, he says, the policy will be "severe." Yet, somehow, hope lives among Tibetans, for a taste of freedom and for the right to worship as they please. In their exile capital of Dharmasala on the Indian side of the Himalayas, they eagerly seize on the words of encouragement that come from Congress, led by a number of Republicans and Democrats moved by Tibetan bravery. Tibetans bless them and President Jimmy Carter, quietly a strong friend of Tibet.

The man who is Tibet's leader and its incarnation of the spirit of God is the 14th Dalai Lama. He usually signs himself "Tenzin Gyatso, Buddhist monk." He lives in Dharmasala, in exile since 1959, but occasionally goes abroad in his nation's cause. Most governments are polite to him but ask that he not say much in their countries—the Chinese, you know.

In June, in Strasbourg, before the European Parliament, he spoke his heart once more. This time he said Tibet would accept China's right to handle Tibetan foreign affairs and keep troops in Tibet, if China would agree to live in association with Tibet and allow it a democratically chosen government where Tibetans manage Tibetan affairs and man and nature lives in harmony.

He did not give away Tibetans sovereignty, which he said Tibetan had never conceded to foreign powers in almost two millennia of existence. But he said he knew that this important, painful step toward acknowledgment of Chinese power would disappoint many Tibetans.

Most newspapers of the world gave the speech zero space. Some printed a few paragraphs. But the Tibetans heard. Many were sorrowful, and some were angry, but all still follow Tenzin Gyatso.

The Chinese responded with a brief, harsh dismissal—and more repressions in Tibet.

China is a great nation and Tibet is small and imprisoned. Is there really any point, beyond sentiment, in keeping the Tibetan file on the desk instead of putting it away in a cabinet of the mind?

Yes, the Tibetans say, perhaps one day the Chinese will change.

The Chinese react with anger when any nation raises the Tibetan question. Yet, Tibetans and their supporters say, that very anger covers a sensitivity to what the world think of China, and the new China may not always want to be seen as cruel and oppressive.

But if the world forgets, the Chinese will pay no price of loss of respect. That will be the end of us, the Tibetans say, and they know the Chinese quite well. So if Tenzin Gyatso still hopes, all who wish him and his people well at least can do what Tibetans ask: Remember them and speak of them.

OMNIBUS DRUG ABUSE BILL OF 1988

HON. BILL EMERSON

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 9, 1988

Mr. EMERSON. Mr. Speaker, the House will soon consider the long-awaited omnibus drug

abuse bill of 1988. Truly, this legislation is the result of a tremendous bipartisan effort to take a definitive stand in the war on drugs, and the bill makes great strides. However, I seriously question the wisdom of the provision requiring a 7-day waiting period before the purchase of handguns and pressing onerous investigations on law-abiding citizens. We should put the burden where it belongs by putting the burden, a heavy burden, on people who commit crimes with firearms.

Mr. Speaker, Wayne LaPierre, the executive director of the National Rifle Association of America, recently testified before the Republican Platform Committee in New Orleans. His testimony offers an effective argument against the waiting-period provision, and I respectfully ask that the text of his testimony be included in the RECORD.

TESTIMONY OF WAYNE LAPIERRE

I appreciate the opportunity to testify before you today.

Mr. Chairman and members of the Committee, I would hope the Republican Platform would once again recognize the constitutional rights of all law-abiding Americans to own and use firearms for recreation, personal protection and all other lawful purposes.

The Second Amendment rights of Americans are one of the fundamental liberties and freedoms bestowed upon American citizens. These rights have been most recently recognized in the Senate Subcommittee on The Constitution's excellent report of 1982 on the right to keep and bear arms, chaired by Utah Senator Orrin Hatch.

Today in our great land, there are over 70 million Americans who lawfully own firearms. That translates into one-half of all American households. Of that, 25 million people engage in hunting each year. Next month, our Olympic shooters will travel to Korea to represent America in the Olympic Games, and the National Rifle Association is proud to be the Official Governing Body for the Shooting Sports for the Olympic Games. I might also add that NRA instructors train most police departments in our land in shooting skills, and each year hundreds of thousands of Americans participate in NRA-supported firearms safety and hunter safety courses in every state in this country.

While our members' activities and occupations are greatly diverse, our membership, and the sportsmen and firearms owners of America stand united against those who would deprive Americans of their Second Amendment rights.

It is in that capacity that I would like to address this committee today.

Today in America we have a crime problem out of control. Likewise, we face a drug epidemic of staggering proportions. There are those opposed to Americans owning firearms that are attempting to use the frustration over crime and drugs as a reason for denying law-abiding Americans their Second Amendment freedoms. There are those so frustrated over the lack of progress in fighting crime and drugs that they will grasp at almost any solution offered—even proposals that may only aggravate the situation.

Mr. Chairman and members of the Committee, we are never going to stop crime and drugs by imposing more restrictive firearms laws on law-abiding Americans. Our failure to deal with crime and drugs is not in any way related to the freedom of Americans to own firearms. In fact, the constitutional

right of American citizens to own firearms not only serves as a deterrent to hardened criminals, but each year protects 650,000 Americans from criminals assault.

Passing more restrictive measures aimed at regulating honest citizens will do nothing to cut violent crime in this country. Instead, the NRA recommends and supports proposals such as:

Automatically revoking parole for any felon caught in possession of a firearm, and eliminate eligibility for reconsideration of parole in these cases.

The Department of Justice should encourage and order U.S. Attorneys to prosecute felons in possession cases. It is absurd that these are considered "nuisance" cases by U.S. Attorneys. When prosecution is requested by State and local law enforcement, 9 out of 10 times the charges are never brought.

Mr. Chairman, every criminological study done on the subject shows that restrictive firearms laws do not cut crime. The solution is we must lock up felons and keep them behind bars so they are not free to roam the streets and prey on American citizens.

It is a tragedy that in many areas of our great land we are putting 38,000 felons in the front door of our prisons and turning 38,000 out the back door to again victimize American citizens.

It is a tragedy that in our great country today prison is seen as a cost of doing business for drug dealers and repeat offenders. They know they won't be kept long and will soon be free to roam the streets and victimize citizens.

It is a tragedy that police officers tell us many criminals see prison as air-conditioning, color TV, and working out. And that is for the 1 out of 107 convicted felons that end up in prison.

Mr. Chairman, the NRA's stands as an ally of our Nation's police and a protector of the constitutional right of law-abiding American citizens to own and use firearms. It was the NRA—working with President Reagan's administration—that wrote and passed the McClure/Volkmer Firearms Owners' Protection Act that provides a mandatory 10-year sentence for anyone even carrying a firearm in a drug trafficking crime. It is the NRA that is working for crime initiatives around the country including a mandatory sentence initiative currently on the ballot in Oregon.

We urge the Platform Committee to recognize the constitutional right of law-abiding American citizens to own and use firearms for lawful purposes and to also support tough crime fighting measures such as I have discussed.

Right now in the U.S. Congress, some are pushing a restrictive firearms proposal offered by Senator Metzenbaum and Congressman Feighan of Ohio. This bill would have the federal government impose on all 50 States a 7-day wait and a police investigation before anyone can buy a handgun. Mr. Chairman, the purpose of the Gun Control Act of 1968 is not to impose Federal policies on the states, but to assist the States.

Mr. Chairman, the majority of our State legislatures have rejected similar proposals. The fact is that laws that may be good for states like New Jersey may not be sound for states such as Wyoming, Texas Ohio, and numerous other States. Clearly, as President Reagan and Vice President Bush have stated, this is an issue for the States to decide.

There is no criminological evidence that show "waiting periods" are effective in re-

ducing crime or keeping firearms out of the hands of criminals. Criminals do not buy firearms legally—they buy them on the black market or they steal them. In the few instances where criminals acquire firearms through legal channels, it has been by the use of false identification—which a "waiting period" and investigation would not have uncovered—or by the use of a strawman buyer who has no criminal record.

Instead of spending taxpayers dollars on proposals such as the Metzenbaum/Feighan/Brady bill—which will spend millions to billions of taxpayers' dollars investigating honest citizens—we should use those tax dollars to build more prisons. We must lock up and keep behind bars drug dealers and repeat offenders who are victimizing American society.

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, I will end my comments here; you have a copy of this testimony before you that includes more detail on the issues I have discussed today.

Thank you.

AMENIA CELEBRATES ITS BICENTENNIAL

HON. HAMILTON FISH, JR.

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 9, 1988

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, it is with great pride that I rise in honor of the bicentennial of the town of Amenia in Dutchess County in my home district of New York.

Amenia was founded on March 7, 1788—a year in which the New York State Legislature established more than 200 towns.

The settlement of Amenia was founded in 1762 by Dr. Thomas Young, a poet who also thought up the community's name. It is derived from the Latin word "Amoena," which means "pleasant to the eye."

Indeed, the countryside—offering vistas of Cascade Mountain, Smithfield Valley, and De La Vergne Hill—must have been pleasing to the settlers, as it is to the residents today. There is a special resonance to the names of the town's roads—Deep Hollow, Butts Hollow, Bog Hollow, and Sinpatch.

The first significant immigration came in the 18th century, when inexpensive farmland attracted settlers from New York and New England.

Iron ore was discovered in Amenia in the 1760's. A foundry and furnace supplied iron for the war effort in the American War of Independence.

The Amenia Seminary, a private Methodist academy established in 1835, enjoyed a good academic reputation and attracted students from throughout the Nation.

Today Amenia still has great vistas, as well as outstanding educational and cultural opportunities within an 80-mile radius. The town—which comprises many neighborhoods, including Smithfield, Wassaic, Box Hollow, Leedsville, South Amenia, and Amenia Union—is particularly noteworthy for its community spirit. Volunteers contribute greatly to the town by serving on town boards, volunteer fire departments and rescue squads and other praiseworthy organizations.

Mr. Speaker, the town has proclaimed August 13 as a time of official celebration. There will be a community picnic, and the Lions Club has donated a birthday cake large enough to feed 400. I am looking forward to taking part in the ceremonies.

I wish the people of Amenia the best as they celebrate their bicentennial.

THE 50TH ANNIVERSARY OF FOUNDING OF TEMPLE BETH TORAH

HON. ROBERT J. LAGOMARSINO

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 9, 1988

Mr. LAGOMARSINO. Mr. Speaker, I rise to bring to the attention of my colleagues the 50th anniversary of the founding of the Ventura County Jewish Council-Temple Beth Torah.

The roots of the Jewish community in Ventura County go back to 1875 to Simon Cohen who was one of the early postmasters of the area now known as El Rio—then known as New Jerusalem. However it was not until 1938 that a handful of local businessmen met on a regular basis in the county. The Jewish community flourished and they moved to a borrowed Coca-Cola bottling building—where free soft drinks were provided—then into other loaned premises; the Odd Fellows Hall, a local dairy where each week they imported a rabbi to conduct services. From those humble beginnings came the core of what is today the Jewish community of some 500 families from all of western Ventura County. Like the county itself, the Jewish community has come a long way since those early days, from those small, spartan meeting rooms to the beautiful temple and community center.

The weekend of Friday, September 30 to Sunday, October 2 will be a time of celebration for the Jewish community, beginning with a special commemorative service on a Friday. Saturday night will see a black tie banquet and festivities will culminate with a festival on Sunday, October 2. On that day men, women, and children will hand carry a torch in a run from the site of the first official meeting place through the streets of Ventura to the lighting of a giant menorah at the present headquarters at Foothill and Kimball Road. The day will end with food and music, the release of thousands of balloons and singing and dancing at the temple. Attendance is expected to exceed 500 people.

Please join me in congratulations to Temple Beth Torah and the Jewish community on their 50 years of service in the area and in wishing them continued success and happiness.

IMPLEMENTING RESOLUTION FOR PALAU COMPACT

HON. MORRIS K. UDALL

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 9, 1988

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, one of the most important pieces of legislation pending before the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs is legislation regarding the future status of Palau.

I, Subcommittee Chairman RON DE LUGO, and 61 other Members of the House have co-sponsored legislation to authorize implementation of a compact of free association with Palau. I have today responded to a letter from President Lazarus Salii of Palau regarding this legislation, which we hope can be enacted this year. Because of the importance of the issues involved, I wish to share this response with my colleagues.

COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR AND
INSULAR AFFAIRS,
U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Washington, DC, August 8, 1988.

HON. LAZARUS E. SALII,
President of Palau
Koror, Palau.

DEAR PRESIDENT SALII: This letter is in response to your letter of August 2 which refers to Insular and International Affairs Subcommittee Chairman Ron de Lugo's recent letter to you, and requests my assistance.

At the outset, I want you to know that there are no differences between Ron de Lugo and myself with respect to the need for and commitment to the fundamental provisions of H.J. Res. 597 which 59 other Members of Congress have joined us in co-sponsoring. I continue to have full confidence in his leadership on the legislation.

We drafted the provisions of the resolution together after consulting with you and other leaders of Palau. Although the exact language of H.J. Res. 597 is not set in concrete, the purposes of the key provisions must be retained and adequately dealt with for this Committee to be able to report Compact implementation legislation.

Assurance that the matters which have created great concern on our part will be adequately addressed is essential if (1) the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs is to fulfill its legislative and oversight responsibilities under the Constitution of the United States, other U.S. law, as well as the Rules of the House of Representatives, and (2) the United States is to complete its responsibilities to the people of Palau as most of those responsibilities are fully assumed by the Government of Palau under the Compact. This Committee, and the Congress, has the right and the responsibility to address these matters in legislation to implement the Compact.

The events which took place in Palau last year required greater congressional scrutiny of the situation in Palau before final action could be taken to terminate the trusteeship because of continuing U.S. responsibilities to the people of Palau. These events were not of our making but were, in large part as you know, within the aegis of the Government of Palau under the authority that the United States has been granted by the United Nations.

No one wishes any more than I that these events in Palau—and others over the past

several years which have come to our attention—had never taken place. Unfortunately, they did. Of necessity, they had to be investigated.

Because of the seriousness of the situation and the apparent extent of the problems, Subcommittee Chairmen de Lugo and George Miller and I requested the assistance of the General Accounting Office of the Legislative Branch of the United States Government to assist this Committee in conducting an investigation.

The GAO (which, with your cooperation, should complete its investigation within the next few months) is not equipped by law, training or resources to conduct investigations for law enforcement purposes. Therefore, when it became apparent from the GAO's investigation and other sources that investigations of potential criminal wrongdoing were required, it also became clear that one of two courses of action needed to be taken. Either the Secretary of the Interior would have to use his broad authority over matters in Palau to conduct the needed investigations and prosecutions where warranted or an independent Palauan authority would need to conduct them. We believe that local action on these matters through independent offices of special prosecutor and public auditor is the preferable course of action. Our legislation, H.J. Res. 597, reflects that belief.

I am well aware of, and sensitive to the volatile nature of local politics, especially in an election year. Regardless of what this Committee does regarding the Compact, someone in Palau may seek to use it for political purposes. We cannot control that.

The fact that they might do so is, however, not a reason for us not to carry out our oversight responsibilities regarding Palau. We, are seeking to address problems in Palau in a fair and impartial way. In doing so, it is not our intent to influence the course of Palau's local politics one way or another. We have no favorites and take no sides in Palau. Our objective is to try to ensure that the people of Palau will have a government that will respect the right of individuals to freely and openly express their views, the right to take their cause to the courts when legal issues arise, the right to have an independent legislature and judiciary free from intimidation, and the right to have integrity in governmental institutions and officials.

It needs to be underscored that the principal reason that the Compact is not in effect today is that, according to Palau's own judicial system, Palau has not yet approved the Compact.

Chairman de Lugo and I are making a good faith effort to explore the issues surrounding implementation of the Compact with the two other committees of the Congress directly involved to see if there is enough common ground on an implementation authorized bill which can pass the Congress this year. If there is, we will consult with Representatives of the Executive Branch of the United States government, the Executive Branch of the Palauan government, and the leaders of the House of Delegates and the Senate of the Legislative Branch of Palau at appropriate steps along the way. As this legislation takes final form, we will continue to try to make sure that it respects the Palauan people, its presidency, its Congress, and the principles of a free democratic system of government while ensuring that the U.S. has carried out its obligations to both the peoples of Palau and the United States.

Time is running out in the 100th Congress, as you are aware. Therefore, we are working with all parties concerned in an attempt to finalize a bill which can pass the Congress this session which will address the chief concerns outlined to you in earlier correspondence and which, hopefully, will be supported by the vast majority of the people of Palau.

Sincerely,

MORRIS K. UDALL,
Chairman.

THE F-16 FALCON—FLYING HIGH

HON. ROBERT K. DORNAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 9, 1988

Mr. DORNAN of California. Mr. Speaker, we are all painfully aware of defense programs that have gone awry—whether through cost overruns or failures in performance. Too often, however, in our tendency to concentrate on problem-plagued programs, we overlook some of the truly remarkable success stories of our military procurement effort. One such success story in which we in Congress can take just pride is that of the Air Force's F-16 Fighting Falcon.

It has recently come to my attention that the F-16 has once again dominated another USAF flying competition; this time the U.S. Air Force, Europe [USAFE], semiannual bombing competition.

In overall standings, the F-16 swept the top three places, with the 50th Tactical Fighter Wing flying F-16C's out of Hahn Air Force Base, leading the way. The "top gun" of the event was Maj. Greg Findlay of the 86th Tactical Fighter Wing, Ramstein Air Base, West Germany. Other F-16 pilots achieved "best scores" in strafing, low-angle bombing, and first-run attack. In fact, in the latter category, one F-16 in its first pass at the target achieved the impressive feat of delivering ordnance within 4 feet of the bullseye.

This impressive competition performance is not a new victory for the F-16 "Flying Falcon." Ever since its entry into the U.S. Air Force stable of fighter aircraft a decade ago, the F-16 has consistently swept the major USAF flying competitions. More importantly, it has proven itself in the true arena for a fighter plane—combat—where it has scored nearly 50 victories over Syrian Soviet-supplied fighters while suffering only a single loss.

In addition to compiling this impressive combat record, the F-16 has also set Air Force peacetime standards for maintenance, safety, readiness, and reliability. There is little wonder why Fortune magazine has recently praised the F-16 as being one of America's highest quality products.

But this is equally impressive—at least as far as we who write the checks are concerned—and that is that F-16's have been consistently produced on time and within budget since production began over 40 years ago. In fact, because of the multiyear procurement process that Congress has approved for F-16 purchase, GAO estimates that more than \$800,000,000 has already been saved during the course of production. Additional

savings of \$315 million are projected by GAO for continuing F-16 multiyear procurement through 1993, resulting in a total of more than \$1 billion not drawn from the U.S. Treasury.

Moreover, the F-16 has become the world's most eagerly sought-after fighter. Sales abroad to over a dozen nations have greatly improved our balance-of-trade situation. In fact, negotiations are now under way to sell 170 F-16's to Japan—a reversal of our usual business dealing with that nation.

This success story has been made possible through the combined efforts of Congress, Department of Defense, and the defense industry. Certainly, the F-16 program represents the very best side of our military procurement process and stands as an example to be emulated.

NO TAXATION WITHOUT SIMPLIFICATION

HON. CARROLL HUBBARD, JR.

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 9, 1988

Mr. HUBBARD. Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to read a recent article which appeared in the August 15 issue of the U.S. News & World Report. The article, "No Taxation Without Simplification," by Mortimer B. Zuckerman, editor-in-chief, effectively summarizes why I recently joined 24 of my colleagues in opposition to the Technical Correction Act.

I applaud the insight Mr. Zuckerman displayed in the article and I faithfully submit this material for print in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD as I believe it tells it like it is.

NO TAXATION WITHOUT SIMPLIFICATION (By Mortimer B. Zuckerman)

Still seething over your tax return? Join the crowd. Two years ago, Dan Rostenkowski, chairman of the House Ways and Means Committee, was one of the heroes when the tax-reform bill went through for the President's signature. Now, he is hearing from the definitely disillusioned. "Explain to my mother about tax simplification," ran one letter. "If your answer is not satisfactory, this 1987 return will be the last she will ever file."

At first, people kept quiet because they felt guilty that they were having trouble with a "simplified" tax system. Now, the feeling of revolt is commonplace; anger has displaced shame. The protesting son was outraged that his 85-year-old mother had to find \$1,100 in accounting fees to prepare her return, three times the prereform cost. It is happening everywhere. Accounting firms report that they have spent more than double the time preparing clients' returns because of an overly complicated law knotted with new regulations.

April 15 used to be the end of the tax season. Before 1986, only about 15 percent of those returns filed by accountants asked for an extension. Now, about 40 percent have sought deferral. Taxpayers have found they need time, patience and professional advice to dissect their past daily life for information demanded by the tax law. It was supposed to be simpler, but the reality is there in the mind-numbing pages of print. We could only be puzzled by the fact that the number of pages in the tax bill had

grown from 185 pages in 1981 to 564 pages in 1984. Think of it, 564 pages! Well, the Tax Reform Act of 1986, which was supposed to simplify our taxes, was 879 pages, and the House resolution to correct the errors in the bill runs to 960 pages. Now think of that!

The mess we are in is evident in the relatively commonplace matter of interest deductions. Taxpayers must keep track of how they spend each borrowed dollar so as to determine if the interest is deductible as passive interest, investment interest, business interest, or is only partly deductible because it is personal interest. The deductibility of home-mortgage interest depends on the type of residence, the number of days it is used, when the debt was incurred—and a home-equity loan has a variety of traps.

Someone who runs a small business from home or rents a room, as many Americans do, must nickel-and-dime how much each expenditure or bit of equipment on the premises is used to earn income, down to making sure that every minute of a business phone is used for business by everyone who uses it, or that no private garbage gets into the business garbage taken away as a business expense.

Imagine how daily transactions would stop dead in their tracks if every time a shopper thought of buying something he had to worry about putting every moment's use down in writing and had no way of knowing the legal definition of different uses for tax purposes. Effectively, that is what is happening with a vengeance today with small businesses, which cannot be sure what is allowable for tax purposes and what is not. Even professional advice is often no more than an educated guess when the Internal Revenue Service is struggling to put forth thousands of regulations because Congress has passed vague laws.

Fairness, as well as simplicity, has been a victim of Congress's games with our tax laws. Not only have many taxpayers incurred higher taxes in 1987 from hidden tax increases in the 1986 tax bill but virtually everybody has had to waste time and energy on documentation that would have been better spent on productive enterprise.

There are major disincentives to enterprise and business here. There is also a serious erosion of the credibility of the American tax system. We have had pride in the voluntary self-assessment of taxes, and there has been a remarkably widespread compliance. This is at risk when millions feel persecuted by paper work and few middle-income Americans or small businesses can figure out their liabilities.

Something is wrong when—in the country born of a tax revolt—the most important document regulating individual social behavior, after the Bible, and the most important document affecting the relationship of the individual to the state, after the Constitution, is that uninspiring mass of convoluted prose called the Internal Revenue Code.

GOVERNOR DUKAKIS AND CIVIL RIGHTS FOR THE DISABLED

HON. TONY COELHO

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 9, 1988

Mr. COELHO. Mr. Speaker, last week President Reagan made a wisecrack about "invalids." As a person with epilepsy, I resent the

callous attitude exhibited by the Reagan-Bush administration toward those with disabilities, of which this remark is symptomatic.

This year I introduced a comprehensive bill that would ensure the civil rights of America's 36 million disabled persons. This bill, the Americans With Disabilities Act, will protect the disabled against discrimination in all sectors of American society.

I am proud to say that Governor Mike Dukakis, the Democratic nominee for President, shares this commitment to civil rights for the disabled. I would like to insert into the RECORD, his statement on this issue.

STATEMENT BY DEMOCRATIC CANDIDATE FOR PRESIDENT MICHAEL S. DUKAKIS ON CIVIL RIGHTS AND EQUAL OPPORTUNITY FOR CITIZENS WITH DISABILITIES

Yesterday, the House gave final passage to the Fair Housing Act of 1988. This bill is a significant advancement for civil rights, not only because it strengthens enforcement and protects families with children, but also because it marks a historic step forward in providing full access and equal opportunity to Americans with disabilities.

I applaud the Fair Housing Act Amendments because for too long stereotypes and discrimination have prevented Americans with disabilities from obtaining housing in our nation's communities. This accomplishment is only a first step. Discrimination is an everyday experience for America's 43 million citizens with disabilities. For too long this prejudice has prevented these citizens from becoming independent and productive and being totally integrated into our society.

Those principles of full participation and equal access are embodied in the Americans With Disabilities Act of 1988. This landmark bill is designed to eliminate discrimination against persons with disabilities in housing, employment, public accommodations, transportation, and communication.

I support the principles and objectives represented by the ADA of 1988. I applaud the efforts of the disability community in working for the objectives of this bill.

In Massachusetts, we have acted on those goals. We have led the fight to overcome discrimination and the attitudinal and physical barriers for persons with disabilities. I have appointed persons with disabilities to head our Commission for the Deaf and Hard of Hearing, the Commission for the Blind, the Massachusetts Rehabilitation Commission, and the Massachusetts State Office of Handicapped Affairs. I issued Executive Order 246 that bans all forms of discrimination against people with disabilities in programs receiving state support. Executive Order 246 also establishes affirmative action hiring in all state agencies for individuals with disabilities.

I signed legislation in 1983 to establish a new transition planning program for young persons with severe disabilities. My administration established the highest level state agency in the country on the deaf and hard of hearing, and a new commission to protect adults with disabilities against neglect. With the passage of our comprehensive health insurance bill, persons with disabilities will no longer fear not having health coverage.

Those examples represent actions not just words. They represent years of leadership, and not a new found awareness. As President, I will continue to provide that same leadership and work with the disability community. As President, I will ensure that all

civil rights statutes are enforced and that persons with disabilities have the opportunity to participate in our government, private sector, and our political process.

I will end barriers to the most fundamental right of citizenship: the right to vote, by requiring the over 188,000 polling places to provide accessibility to the elderly and persons with disabilities. My goal is to promote and ensure social integration, personal independence and equality of opportunity for all individuals with disabilities. The Americans With Disabilities Act of 1988 is a major step in protecting the civil rights of persons with disabilities and I will work with the Congress to produce legislation that embodies the principles of this act.

HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION 602

HON. DANTE B. FASCELL

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 9, 1988

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of House Joint Resolution 602, which calls for the restoration of a free and independent Cambodia and the protection of the Cambodian people from a return to power of the Khmer Rouge, whose genocidal reign we recall with horror and shame. I would like to commend Mr. ATKINS, the principal sponsor of this resolution, as well as Mr. SOLARZ and Mr. LEACH, the chairman and ranking member of the Subcommittee on Asian and Pacific Affairs, for the support and prompt action on this resolution.

We have all noted, I am sure, the recent developments in Southeast Asia which indicate that negotiations may be underway at last toward a resolution of the Cambodian question. We applaud the prospect of peace returning to the troubled country of Cambodia and the contribution that such a development would make toward the achievement of greater stability in this part of the world.

In this resolution we make an unequivocal statement that a Cambodian settlement must contain workable measures to prevent the return of the Khmer Rouge to power. It is unthinkable that a regime which has permitted the autogenocide of more than 1 million of its own people could be allowed to return to power.

It is therefore appropriate and timely that we approve this resolution, clearly stating the policy of the United States and urging the international community to use all appropriate means to prevent the return to power of Pol Pot and to permit the Cambodian people to determine their future in freedom and dignity.

We cannot erase our past actions or inactions. We can, however, do our best not to allow the repeat of tragic errors. This resolution is an important step toward that end. I urge my colleagues to support the passage of House Joint Resolution 602.

PUBLIC SERVANT ALAN CROGAN

HON. ROBERT J. LAGOMARSINO

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 9, 1988

Mr. LAGOMARSINO. Mr. Speaker, allow me to take this opportunity to pay tribute to one of the 19th District's outstanding public servants, Mr. Alan M. Crogan. After serving Santa Barbara County faithfully for almost a dozen years, Alan Crogan will soon be leaving his position as chief probation officer to accept an appointment as Youthful Offender Parole Board representative with the State of California.

Alan Crogan began his career as a public servant years before his arrival in Santa Barbara County, first as a U.S. Marine and then as an employee of the Probation Department of San Diego County. He moved to Santa Barbara County in 1977, and won, within 3 years of his arrival there, appointment as chief probation officer. In that capacity he has served the county well, coping admirably with shrinking budgets and an increasing workload. Somehow, Mr. Crogan also found time enough to involve himself with the Santa Barbara Rape Crisis Center, the Criminal Justice Program at Santa Barbara City College, the County Law Enforcement Chiefs and the Santa Barbara Citizens Council on Crime. California Governor Deukmejian has twice appointed Mr. Crogan to the State Board of Corrections.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, I know that I speak for the people of Santa Barbara County when I say that they will miss the leadership that this man has provided at the Probation Department, and the friendship this man has given to the community as a whole. We wish him well in all future endeavors. Although his new job may necessitate a relocation, Alan Crogan and his family will always be able to call Santa Barbara County their home.

SUPPLY-SIDE ECONOMICS— FAILURE AS HUNGER REMEDY

HON. GARY L. ACKERMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 9, 1988

Mr. ACKERMAN. Mr. Speaker, despite 5 years of steady economic expansion, 20 million Americans, especially the elderly, homeless and low-income women, infants and children, do not have enough to eat. It is clear that supply-side economics has failed as a remedy for hunger. The unevenness of economic growth has left millions of people falling further behind. More than 32 million people live below the poverty line, an increase of more than 3 million since 1980. Two-thirds of those seeking emergency food assistance are children and their parents, as are one-third of the homeless.

Hunger in New York City has become a chronic condition for hundreds of thousands of residents. Requests for emergency assistance in my congressional district in Queens have risen dramatically even though the city's

economy is now stronger than it was during the last decade. The Reagan administration has turned soup kitchens and food pantries from a Depression-era memory into a reality today. These volunteer food providers, originally established as "emergency" facilities, are now a permanent resource utilized regularly by hundreds of thousands of New Yorkers.

If one factor stands out as a major contributor to hunger and poverty in New York City, it is the dramatically reduced level of Federal assistance available to low-income residents, particularly in the Food Stamp Program. While U.S. Secretary of Agriculture Richard Lyng and his top nutrition aide, John Bode, told congressional committees earlier this year that food is always available for the Nation's hungry and that food stamp spending is high enough, the fact is, Federal cutbacks have exacerbated poverty by cutting all programs designed to provide basic needs.

As a member of the Select Committee on Hunger, I have heard over and over again from people across the Nation who are struggling, yet unable to make ends meet—even when food stamps are combined with benefits from other assistance programs. In New York City housing costs are so astronomical that recipients of food stamps and other public assistance are forced to make the cruel choice between food and shelter. This has driven thousands of food stamp recipients to New York's growing network of food pantries and soup kitchens to supplement their inadequate food stamp benefits. Clearly, our present Food Stamp Program is not adequate, and emergency food needs of low-income Americans are not being met.

The time has come to adopt national policies that reflect our national will to eliminate homelessness, poverty, and hunger. That is why I strongly support passage of H.R. 4060, the Emergency Hunger Relief Act of 1988. The measure will ensure that low-income families and individuals receive adequate nutrition assistance in an expeditious manner, and develop a delivery system that will not further complicate or add to the administration of established nutrition assistance programs.

First, the bill would extend authorization for the Temporary Emergency Food Assistance Program [TEFAP] through September 30, 1989, at the current level of \$50 million. TEFAP, which provides surplus agricultural commodities to the needy, has been drastically reduced as a result of changes in the dairy price support program and accelerated donations and sales which depleted the vast supply of commodities. In addition, it requires the Department of Agriculture to purchase 110 million dollars worth of commodities in fiscal 1989 to help compensate for the reduced availability of cheese and other commodities in recent months.

In response to growing awareness of the extent of hunger in this country and the understanding that any food that goes to waste represents a missed opportunity to feed hungry people, the bill would establish a national gleaning clearinghouse to collect and disseminate information concerning the kinds, amounts, and geographic location of agricultural products available for gleaning.

The measure also would increase basic food stamp benefits above the normal inflation adjustment by an average of 70 cents in October 1988, and \$2.25 in October 1989. Other provisions will improve the Food Stamp Program by providing additional information to the needy about food stamp benefits; reducing barriers to participation for the elderly, disabled, farmers, and migrant workers; improving the efficiency of the program by reforming the quality-control system so that appeals are expedited and the number of claims levied on States are substantially reduced; and provide a contingency clause so that if budget sequestration takes place, the cost provisions of the bill will not be implemented.

Despite commendable efforts by State and local governments to deal with the problems associated with hunger, they cannot achieve effective solutions without a strong commitment from the Federal Government. Food is a basic human need, and access to adequate food should remain a right for every American.

I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting passage of H.R. 4060, to help meet the emergency food needs of low-income Americans.

BANKRUPTCY BREEDS DESPERATION

HON. THOMAS J. DOWNEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 9, 1988

Mr. DOWNEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, in 5 short months, when the Reagan era is finally over, political pundits will begin the process of reflecting on this administration's more honorable and not-so-honorable moments. This week's revelation that the Reagan administration has, through the back channels, tried to embarrass and undermine Costa Rican President Oscar Arias should certainly weigh in heavily on the list of "less than honorable" schemes of the Reagan years.

Most Americans agree that the Reagan doctrine for Central America has gone bankrupt. It's been a failure. And, in classic and all too familiar fashion, the administration has made a desperate attempt to pin the blame elsewhere. So now they want to blame President Arias, a leader they once embraced, at least for the cameras.

No doubt, the Arias peace plan for Central America has some problems. Nicaragua has caused a fair number of them. But it seems clearer now than ever before that peace was never part of the Reagan plan for Central America. And so, when President Arias put his plan forward—a plan which eventually won him a much deserved Noble Prize—the State Department, while praising Arias a man "admired throughout the world for his noble efforts on behalf of peace", began its own campaign to discredit and debunk him. What a fine and noble picture to present to all those fledgling democracies in Central America that we are trying so hard to nurture!

Maybe I shouldn't be so shocked by all of this. Maybe, after 8 years, I should be used to administration words that say one thing and administration deeds that do something quite

the opposite. But America is bigger than that. This is a Nation that was born out of new ideas, and so, it is a Nation that has a deep and abiding respect for others who put forward sound and capable plans designed to help nations work together toward a common dream of peace and prosperity. Americans want to help such leaders, not deride them. As such a leader, President Arias deserves our thanks, our support and our constructive advice. Most Americans have not forgotten that, though the administration apparently has.

HONORING THE HOLLOWAY OLD TIMERS BASEBALL CLUB

HON. DOUGLAS APPELGATE

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 9, 1988

Mr. APPELGATE. Mr. Speaker, it is my privilege to honor the Holloway Old Timers Baseball Club. Located in Belmont County, OH, in my congressional district, this organization was founded in 1948 and is the oldest in the Nation. The Saturday before Labor Day is set aside each year for all who ever played baseball for or against Holloway, to get together and renew old friendships and to reflect on the past.

There are ball games for the sons and grandsons of the Old Timers, softball games for the women, and baseball doubleheaders for the "Old Timers" where former players from 80 to 90 years old, on down to age 35 participate. These events are followed by a lunch which is paid for by the citizens and donations. The day wraps up with an "Old Timers" softball game, giant parade, band shows, entertainment, and then round and square dancing.

Over 500 people from all over the United States attend this event annually. They plan and save all year for this event. The emotional and sentimental returnees will tell you they live for this day. Many who have played in Holloway and who have gone on to play baseball in the major leagues such as Cy Young, Joe Niekro, Harold "Hal" King, Frank "Buck" Wallace have supported and continued to support this event and urge that it never change.

This nonprofit and self-supporting organization has enjoyed much success over the years because of its concerned and committed membership and its well organized format.

The Holloway Old Timers Baseball Club continues to be a source of pride to everyone in the small village of Holloway. The members of this club have come together in pursuit of common goals and friendship, and the spirit of comradery and support that prevails within its membership has undoubtedly had a profound and positive effect on each member.

Mr. Speaker, this event allows members to share fellowship and renew friendships. As the oldest organization of its kind, the Holloway Old Timers Baseball Club has achieved a praiseworthy record of service in the sports community.

I extend my personal congratulations to all members of the Holloway Old Timers Baseball Club for their undying commitment to not only

baseball, but for continuing to be the community mainstay it is today.

HOUSE RESOLUTION 484

SPEECH OF

HON. DANTE B. FASCELL

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 8, 1988

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of House Resolution 484 and urge my colleagues to support this resolution. I would also like to commend Representatives SOLARZ and LEACH, the Chairman and ranking member of the Subcommittee on Asian and Pacific Affairs, and in addition, Representatives YATRON and SOLOMON of the Subcommittee of Human Rights and International Organizations, for their diligence in pursuing this matter and in bringing this resolution to the floor of the House.

While the resolution takes note of the recently announced decision of President Zia to hold elections on November 16, 1988, it urges him to hold these elections on a party basis. We recognize the longstanding relationship between the United States and Pakistan and note that lifting of martial law in 1985 and other subsequent steps in Pakistan represent movement toward a more democratic society. Establishment of a genuine democracy in Pakistan would greatly facilitate the further improvement of relations between our two countries.

This resolution represents a statement of our most basic American value, belief that all people should have the right to determine their government through free and fair elections. We strongly support the progress made by the people of Pakistan toward democracy and urge continued progress, consistent with their constitutions, the development of a more democratic political system.

(House Resolution 484 expresses our interest in democracy in Pakistan, just as we have previously expressed support for movement toward democracy in many other countries of the world. I urge adoption of this resolution.

TRIBUTE TO MANOLO REYES

HON. CLAUDE PEPPER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 9, 1988

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, a distinguished citizen of my district, Mr. Manolo Reyes, recently celebrated his 50th uninterrupted year in public information service. He regaled an appreciative audience with many delightful remembrances of that half of a century in which he had had a very active part. Mr. Reyes has had a distinguished career and made a very important contribution to the public and journalistic life of the Miami area. He is a revered and highly esteemed citizen. The community generally heartily joined in the heartfelt appreciation shown on this occasion by a large and admiring audience. I ask that the interesting

speech Mr. Reyes made on this occasion appear in the RECORD following my remarks.

The speech follows:

The night I won the Emmy I said it was a climax in my career as a journalist.

But today is the night of nights.

Today, I achieve 50 years of consecutive work—accompanied by my family—and accompanied by my friends.

What else can a person strive for?

On this Earth there are two wonderful words in any language: Please and Thank You.

For me—tonight—is a big night for a big Thank You.

First and above all, Thank God that I've made it to here.

True that there has been times of anxiety, tears and despair. Times in which I made many mistakes, and I'm still making mistakes. However, I welcome those times—particularly I welcome the opportunity of making mistakes because it strengthens the responsibility to correct them.

In my life I have prayed many nights and I keep praying for my family and friends because in praying to God we have a phone which is never busy.

Thank you to Ofelia and Manolo, my parents. They brought me into life. They taught me to be what I am and even though my mother died 4 years ago, and my father 20 years ago, they have an eternal life in my prayers and in my soul.

Thank you to the Brothers of La Salle. I came from a very poor but honest family. For ten years—from 7 to 17 years of age, the Brothers had me in Elementary and High School in Cuba without paying a penny.

In the meantime, from 1938 to 1960 I worked 22 years of my life in one Radio and TV station: CMQ in Havana. Thank you to their owners—Miguel Gabriel—Angel Cambo—the Mestre's brothers and particularly to Arturo Chabau who trained me in how to be an Executive.

In 1960 I came to Miami, a political refugee with my wife and children. Five days later I started to work at Channel 4. For 18 years I was its Latin News Editor. Thank you to all my friends at Channel 4 who helped me and my family in the new midwest, especially to Col. and Mrs. Mitchell Wolfson, Ralph Renick, and Jim Brossmer.

For the last ten years I have worked for the Hospital Industry in Miami. Six years at Palmetto General Hospital—three years at Hialeah Hospital and now—since a year ago—at Mercy Hospital.

Thank you to all my friends there, particularly Dr. Eliot Berg and Dr. Edward Truppan, Chairman and Vice Chairman of the Board of Directors of Palmetto General Hospital. Terry M. Carson, Former President of Hialeah Hospital—and to my friend and supervisor—the President and Chief Executive Officer of Mercy Hospital, Edward J. Rosasco, Jr.

As you can see all my bosses from Cuba and the United States are here tonight. It means a lot to me and to my family.

Now I want to render a special tribute of thanks to the person who has shared 37 of the 50 years we celebrate today. A person who in the good times and the bad times has inspired my life with her love, her understanding and her very special smile. My wife Grace. I love you.

As you already know, she plotted this night with my daughter Graciela. Graciela—my fiancée—as she is called by her mother. Thank you for this wonderful night—for this wonderful birthday present. I love you.

My thanks also to her husband—my dear son-in-law, Octavio Visiedo. Graciela and Octavio are now in their 16 years of marriage with two beautiful daughters—Michelle and Melissa. I love you all.

Thank you to my son Manolo—my wife's fiancée as I call him. Thank you to my dear daughter-in-law, Loujean. Manolo and Loujean are now in their 10 years of marriage with two lovely children—Nicole and Manolo Jr. I love you all.

Thank you to my son Carlos—Charlie—El Benjamin—el mas joven (the youngest of all). Thank you to my dear daughter-in-law, Miriam. Carlos and Miriam are now reaching two years of marriage. No children yet. I love you all.

Last but not least, my mother-in-law—Graciela who at 87 years of age is still very active. I love her as the son she never had.

Tonight I see in 50 years of work ALMOST the realization of the American Dream. And I say ALMOST because Cuba—my country of birth—which I love with all my heart—is not free. It is under tyranny. In my feelings I have the rare privilege of having two nations to defend and serve: Cuba and the United States.

Since I came to this great nation, seven Presidents—whether Republicans or Democrats—have been in the White House. On behalf of my family and myself our endless gratitude not only to them but to the American people for their hospitality at the time when we needed it the most.

I love the United States of America.

I will always love and respect the woman who was my mother, but I will always love and respect the woman who helped me to raise my children.

In conclusion—Tonight I am fulfilling the three main goals of my life: God—country—and family.

Thank you all and each one of you.

Thank you for helping me in the celebration of 50 years of work.

This can only happen in America!

NATIONAL SUBCONTRACTOR AWARD

HON. JAMES M. INHOFE

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 9, 1988

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. Speaker, Tulsa is proud to be the home of this year's National Subcontractor of the Year. On July 18, the U.S. Small Business Administration presented its Administrator's Award of Excellence to Walden's Machine, Inc. in Tulsa, OK in recognition of its outstanding performance as a subcontractor. Walden's is subcontracted by the Boeing Co., to manufacture large and small precision machine detail parts and assemblies for use in commercial aircraft.

At the request of Mr. Walden, the award was presented to the entire staff at the shift change because "they are the ones entitled to it." This insistence on sharing the recognition of excellence with the people who work so hard to produce a good product says much for the management style of Mr. Walden and the quality of his work force.

In further recognition of the fine work done by the people at Walden's Machine Inc., it has also been named the 1988 Small Disadvantaged Business Supplier of the Year.

Walden Machine's Inc. is an exceptional company and sets a fine example for subcontractors across the country. It truly embodies the motto of our great State of Oklahoma, "Labor Conquers All Things."

TRIBUTE TO LEE STEELE,
TOLEDO BLADE RELIGION
EDITOR

HON. MARCY KAPTUR

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 9, 1988

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to an outstanding woman from Ohio's Ninth District who, as the Religion Editor and member of the Toledo Blade's news staff for nearly 40 years, established an unparalleled standard of professionalism in news reporting. Mrs. Lee Steele died on August 1, 1988 after an heroic fight against cancer for the past 10 years.

Mrs. Steele, who joined the Toledo Blade's news staff in 1950 was widely respected by leaders of all religious denominations in her role as religion editor, a post she assumed in 1967. Her thorough and fair coverage of religious news throughout Ohio and Michigan was a hallmark of Mrs. Steele's dedication to the religious communities she served through her profession. As the first recipient of a communicators award recognizing outstanding coverage of religion by the Ohio Council of Churches Committee on Communications, Mrs. Steele further demonstrated the respect and admiration which she solicited from leaders of all faiths.

As a native of Newark, NJ, she received a bachelor of arts degree from the New Jersey College for Women, now a division of Rutgers University, and a master's degree in journalism from Syracuse University. Her zeal for learning continued in later years at the University of Toledo and Bowling Green State University where she studied international law, international trade, social legislation, investment banking, advanced economics and labor problems.

Mrs. Steele was a former secretary of the National Religion News Writers Association and founder and first president of the Toledo chapter of Women in Communications, Inc. She continued to set new precedents for women in journalism in her capacity as a reporter for national and State conventions of the League of Women and the Federation of Women's Clubs. Her interests were wide and varied as demonstrated by her coverage of courts, the city, county and Federal issues, as well as in her role as music and drama critic during her tenure at the Toledo Blade.

Mrs. Steele, herself an ordained minister, presided at more than a dozen weddings of friends and coworkers. In 1985, she was named one of Toledo's Women of Achievement for her newspaper career and was frequently sought after for her skills as a public speaker, author, and teacher.

The Toledo Blade and, in fact, the journalistic profession as a whole, has lost a sensitive and forthright contributor. Those of us who benefited from her articulate and insightful re-

porting of issues pertaining to faith and religion—issues central to so many of us—will miss her greatly.

H.R. 4060, THE EMERGENCY HUNGER RELIEF ACT

HON. NICK JOE RAHALL II

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 9, 1988

Mr. RAHALL. Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased that H.R. 4060, the Emergency Hunger Relief Act was passed yesterday under suspension of the rules. Since a bill authorizing more than \$100 million requires the approval of the Democratic Steering and Policy Committee to be considered under suspension of the rules, I think it is significant that this important piece of legislation was granted approval. It passed uncontested without a rollcall vote and, therefore, demonstrates an earnest bipartisan concern for the hungry in this country.

Mr. Speaker, I have long stood in strong support of the Temporary Emergency Food Assistance Program [TEFAP] because it has meant so much to so many people in my district, and all over the great State of West Virginia. The need for this program, however, was never so apparent until its existence was recently threatened. During the past few months, I have received over 1,000 letters from all over the State of West Virginia reiterating the importance of this program and asking that I do all in my power to keep intact the vital supply of surplus commodities provided by TEFAP.

The Emergency Hunger Relief Act would extend TEFAP for 1 year and require the purchase of \$110 million worth of additional commodities for distribution. From this \$110 million, \$70 million would be distributed under current TEFAP procedures, which are determined by the number of poor people and the number of unemployed in a State. The remaining \$40 million is targeted at providing nutrition assistance to the homeless, and thus will be spent on commodities to be distributed to soup kitchens and food banks.

The bill also addresses previous problems found in the Food Stamp Program by raising benefits, facilitating participation, and improving efficiency. Beginning in October of this year, the monthly food stamp benefit will be raised an average of 70 cents per person, up to \$2.25 in October 1989, not including regular inflation adjustments.

Many people who are in desperate need of food stamps and are eligible to apply do not know how to go about it or are wary of the application process. The Emergency Hunger Assistance Act includes several measures aimed at making the application process easier. It expands the definition of "disabled" for food stamp purposes and allows the elderly and disabled with medical expenses over \$35 per month to claim a deduction from income for food stamp purposes for recurring medical expenses, without having to submit information and verification each month—as long as the expenses are initially verified. The bill also requires that States inform applicants for aid to

families with dependent children [AFDC] that food stamp applications may be submitted at the same time.

In an effort to make the administration of food stamps more smooth and effective, this bill improves several aspects of quality control to assure that eligible food stamp recipients receive the proper amount and that appeals claims are handled in a fair and efficient manner.

Mr. Speaker, this is a good bill and it is a vital bill for many, many people in West Virginia. I stand firm in my support for the Emergency Hunger Relief Act and will continue to do all I can to alleviate hunger in the great State of West Virginia and all over the United States.

RENEGOTIATION OF EXCESSIVELY PRICED NATURAL GAS CONTRACTS

HON. JIM BATES

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 9, 1988

Mr. BATES. Mr. Speaker, the energy shortage of the 1970's has been replaced by surplus in the 1980's and energy prices have fallen substantially. Wholesale oil prices, which reached a peak of \$35.24 per barrel in 1981 have declined by almost 50 percent to \$17.91 in 1987. In the natural gas industry, average wholesale prices peaked in 1984 at \$2.66 per million British thermal units and have since declined to \$1.71 per million Btu in 1987, a 36 percent decrease.

While the two industries have experienced surplus and general price declines, the behavior of the two markets has differed substantially. The oil market, which had always operated with less government intervention and has completely deregulated in 1981, quickly reached a point of homogeneous pricing. The gas industry, however, developed a hierarchy of producer prices in which producers received anywhere from \$0.30 to upward of \$10 per million Btu for the sale natural gas without any substantial difference in the commodity. The upper range of pricing was an artifact of the regulatorily induced shortage and bore little relation to the costs of resource development.

These excessively high prices still exist today even though the gas industry has been in surplus since at least 1983 and the current price of spot gas is between \$1.25 and \$1.50 per million Btu. These high prices are due to contracts which were signed during the shortage years, under a comprehensive regulatory system and which are still being upheld by the courts even though the market and the regulatory system have changed substantially.

During the last 5 years, the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission [FERC] has tried to implement a more competitive and therefore more homogeneous pricing system in the gas industry through a number of major initiatives. They first opened up the demand side of the market by relieving local distribution companies [LDC's] of their historical obligation to purchase gas from interstate pipelines in Order 380 (1984). This allowed LDC's to pur-

chase natural gas from any supplier, placing a severe burden on the interstate pipelines to eliminate many of the pipelines' long-term supply contracts which has been a condition of FERC certification and which had been necessary to met the contract obligations to the LDC's.

In 1985, FERC Order 436 opened up the interstate transmission network, allowing any party to transport gas without having to obtain the extensive regulatory approvals required under prior regulations. This order exacerbated the pipelines' already serious over-commitment problem and was accompanied by FERC statements suggesting voluntary renegotiation of gas supply contracts between pipelines and their producers. Finally, FERC Order 500 (1987) has effectively imposed a cutoff date of December 31, 1988, for high-priced contract reformation by denying cost passthrough for settlements achieved after the date.

All of these orders mandated certain actions by the interstate pipelines, over whom the FERC has jurisdiction derived from the Natural Gas Act of 1938 et seq. However, the FERC has stated that the Natural Gas Policy Act of 1978 precludes its ability to force any action on producers. The FERC has therefore relied upon voluntary renegotiation by those producers who still maintain their excessively high priced contracts.

As one would expect from such a system, most producers have complied with the FERC request and have renegotiated their high priced contracts in line with current market realities. The others, however, have relied upon the courts in the producing States to enforce their antiquated contracts and have retained their ability to sell gas at prices greater than \$10 per million Btu while other gas, priced at \$1.50, is left in the ground. As the deadline for renegotiation approaches, these recalcitrant producers now have the ability to either continue selling their high priced gas or, if they decide to renegotiate, they can exact excessive settlements.

The overall result is that those producers who have not responded to the FERC and the market are doubly enriched. They have continued to sell their gas over the last 3 years at five to six times the amount that the market would otherwise dictate and now they can receive excessive settlements for contract reformation.

The Congress, in the NGPA, and the FERC, through their orders of the last 5 years, have determined that it is in the national interest to have a competitive market for natural gas production. To that end, the FERC has devised a system in which all industry participants, producers, pipelines, LDC's and consumers, share in the transition costs. By not participating in the process, the recalcitrant producers are both enjoying a windfall by selling their gas at extreme prices and are harming all other participants in the industry. Their costs will have to be paid by the pipelines, LDC's and the gas consumers, especially those without energy alternatives. In addition, as these excess costs increase the delivered price of gas to end users, the netback price received by producers who have participated in the industry transition will be diminished. Aside from

the inequity of having participating producers receive less for their production, diminished prices will also have a deleterious effect on new exploration and production, harming the entire Nation.

Since the FERC has professed its inability to alleviate this situation, I have introduced a bill to require that producers renegotiate excessively high priced contracts so that all consumers can benefit from the energy price reductions of the last 5 years. In the event that the parties cannot agree to renegotiated terms, the bill provides that either party would then have the right to terminate the contract.

The actions taken by the FERC in setting aside minimum payment and minimum purchase provisions in existing contracts between pipelines and their customers—order 380—initiated the huge take-or-pay liability exposure of gas consumers, LDC's and pipelines. Such actions were upheld by the courts, as being within the Commission's authority pursuant to the Natural Gas Act. In the attached proposed statute, Congress would act directly to set aside contractual provisions on the same basis: that such contract provisions are inconsistent with the public interest. Such congressional action is clearly within the constitutional power of Congress, when applied to interstate commerce.

THE WHARTON STUDY: MAQUILAS SAVE U.S. JOBS—AND A LOT MORE

HON. JIM KOLBE

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 9, 1988

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Speaker, Congress has devoted much attention recently to glasnost and Mikhail Gorbachev's restructuring of the Soviet state. It is appropriate that we do so. Yet a no less important political opening is underway on our own continent. I am speaking of the recent Presidential elections in Mexico.

Characterized by unprecedented dialog and dissent, the Mexican elections may signal the start of a new era of pluralism in the largest, most populous nation in Central America. For the first time in history, the opposition staged a serious challenge to the ruling Institutional Revolutionary Party. The PRI candidate and President-elect, Carlos Salinas de Gortari, will assume office in December after officially garnering only 50.3 percent of the vote. Meanwhile, activists on the right and left are defining what their role will be in the new order.

Though the vast majority of American citizens watched Mexico's elections only from a distance, the outcome will have a direct effect on both countries. Our nations share a common boundary, the longest such division between a developed and developing country on Earth. Whatever the issue—be it drugs or immigration or environmental quality—the United States has a real stake in Mexico's future.

Conversely, many Mexican citizens are closely following the progress of the Presidential elections in the United States for the same reason. They are watching the candidates and listening for policy pronouncements that will shape the course of things to come.

One issue that profoundly concerns both of us is trade. Mexico is our third largest trade partner, and we are her largest. Our shared experience has been that United States-Mexico trade is inherently good, and it promotes cooperation in other areas.

Though I represent Arizona, a border State, there is no "special interest" in trade expansion. Rather, there is a compelling national interest in doing so. This is elementary economics, besides being common sense. Improve Mexico's economy and they will buy more United States products. Team up with Mexico and they will help make the United States more competitive.

Trade expansion means more jobs on both sides of the border. It means a higher standard of living for this and future generations. It means both countries can compete in a global economy—an economy whose benefits we enjoy but whose responsibilities we are sometimes reluctant to accept.

Two-way trade between Mexico and the United States is already enormous: \$34 billion last year and growing rapidly. These are hard statistics, hard facts. Yet they border on the abstract because they are so far removed from our daily life experiences. The numbers need to be refocused and personalized. The auto worker in Michigan, the seamstress in South Carolina—do their jobs depend on trade with Mexico? Quite often, the answer is yes. But the precise link between us and them can be difficult to prove.

Unfortunately, the complexity of commerce is not wasted on those who oppose trading with Mexico. Rather than try to understand the real issues, trade regressionists deliberately confuse them. They delight in depersonalizing trade, in twisting its meaning into "simplifications" that serve their selfish interests, and in substituting slogans for factual analysis. They hammer away at the theme that doing business with Mexico means sacrificing United States jobs. Stop investing in Mexico, they suggest, and United States workers will enjoy unending prosperity.

This makes for nice chants. But we are left wondering: what are U.S. workers supposed to do if they are blocked from competing in the international market? To borrow a phrase from the Speaker of this House, if America is truly to remain great, our work force must do more than deliver pizzas to each other.

Until recently, however, we have lacked conclusive scientific data that pinpoint the indirect impact of trade with Mexico on employment levels in the United States. Unfettered by facts, the protectionists have prolonged their charade.

Prolonged, that is, until now.

Last February, the AFL-CIO challenged Secretary of Labor Anne Dore McLaughlin to commission a scientific report in one of the most important and controversial elements of United States-Mexico trade: Mexico's "twin plant" or maquiladora program. The maquila program enables United States companies to establish wholly owned assembly plants in Mexico, independent of their other restrictions on foreign investment. Under item 807 of the United States tariff schedules, 100 percent United States-made components can be exported to Mexico, assembled in the maquila plants, and returned to the United States for

final assembly, processing, and distribution. Duty is imposed only on the value added in Mexico—that is, on the labor used during maquila assembly.

Established in 1965, the maquila program was designed to promote economic growth in Mexico's traditionally depressed border states. It surpassed even the most optimistic expectations. In 1986, maquilas employed more than 250,000 Mexican workers. This figure now exceeds 300,000 and is expected to rise to 400,000 by 1992. Maquila output has grown an average of 13 percent per year since 1975. Last year, output grew nearly 20 percent. The total value of maquila production was \$5.6 billion in 1986, concentrated in the electric and electronics, automotive, and textile sectors.

Maquilas help the U.S. economy as well. Besides the obvious benefit to United States firms operating in Mexico, tariff item 807 provides an incentive for maquilas to use components made by United States workers in United States factories. Indeed, without the maquila option, many U.S. companies could not afford to maintain any U.S. plants. They would be forced either to move their operations to Southeast Asia or to go out of business altogether.

The AFL-CIO has long argued that the maquila program costs U.S. jobs. They advocate the repeal of tariff item 807 as a way to help U.S. workers. Thus, it was commendable for the AFL-CIO to call for a scientific study of the issue. And it was equally commendable for the Secretary of Labor to take up the challenge by directing Wharton Econometric Forecasting Associates, one of the world's most respected economic consulting firms, to do the analysis.

That study, entitled "The Implication for the U.S. Economy of Tariff Schedule Item 807 and Mexico's Maquila Program," was released last month. Yet thus far, I have seen no mention of it in the AFL-CIO newspaper. Why? Could it have something to do with the fact that the Wharton study totally contradicts their claim that maquilas cost U.S. jobs? Or that it states unequivocally that eliminating the maquila program would clearly not save, but would actually destroy, tens of thousands of U.S. jobs in component manufacturing?

I believe the working people of this country have a right to know the findings of the Wharton study. Most previous reports on maquilas pose compelling questions but stop short of providing answers. Such was the case with a report issued last January by the U.S. International Trade Commission, entitled "The Use and Economic Impact of TSUS Items 806.30 and 807.00," requested by the distinguished gentleman from Florida, the chairman of the Subcommittee on Trade, Mr. GIBBONS. The ITC report highlighted trends in the use of these tariff incentives with emphasis on Mexico's maquila industry. It made some estimates on the impact of item 807 on U.S. employment in component and assembly industries. However, the ITC did not analyze the larger impact to the U.S. economy if 807 or the maquila program were curtailed or repealed, as labor organizations have advocated.

In contrast, the Wharton study gauges the impact of 807 and the maquila industry both on U.S. employment and GNP. Using an

econometric model, the study quantifies several possible scenarios, including: eliminating 807 for goods produced only in Mexico; eliminating 807 for all countries; and eliminating of the maquila program in Mexico.

The Wharton study concludes that under all scenarios, "both the Mexican Maquila Program and TSUS section 807 benefit the U.S. economy. The net benefit stems from the impact of lower U.S. prices and the demand for U.S. manufacturing components overwhelming the impact of potentially higher assembly production in the United States.

In other words, if the maquila program or 807 were eliminated, U.S. firms would be forced to buy higher priced substitute components. A significantly higher portion of these substitutes would come from foreign countries. U.S. workers would be laid off. While some individual U.S. assembly plants might benefit, their gain would be outstripped by the far greater loss of jobs in the component sector. Under the first scenario—eliminating tariff item 807 only for Mexico—Wharton concludes that after 6 years, real United States GNP is \$2.6 billion less than it otherwise would have been. The output losses correspond to a loss of 21,000 jobs in the first year after repeal, which grows to 76,000 after 6 years. Forty percent of the total loss—29,000 jobs—is in manufacturing.

If 807 is repealed for all countries, real U.S. GNP falls \$3 billion in 4 years. By the sixth year, 85,000 jobs are lost, mostly in textiles and nonelectric machinery. Despite a drop in imports, the economy suffers because prices rise. Higher prices for components depress demand. "Specifically," the study notes, "textiles confront high tariffs, inducing a large price increase in a sector which is extremely price sensitive. Thus, prices rise in price-sensitive sectors, inducing a drop in consumption of both U.S. mad output as well as foreign made output."

In the unlikely event that Mexico eliminates the maquila program entirely—effectively increasing Mexican production costs by 50 percent—real United States GNP falls by more than \$2 billion after 1 year after repeal and \$3.7 billion in the sixth year. The cost in human terms is staggering: 92,000 U.S. jobs lost by 1992. The manufacturing sector accounts for most of the job loss, with the nonelectric machinery and automobile industries taking the biggest hit. The Wharton study is enlightening for another reason. Its exhaustive quantitative analysis makes it possible to identify some of the trends that are shaping the maquila program.

One of the most positive findings is that the number of highly skilled Mexican workers in the maquila plants is rising as a percentage of the total work force. Similarly, the percentage of workers involved in basic assembly and cottage industries is declining.

Thus, maquilas are acting as a bridge for improving the greater welfare of the Mexican people. They are bringing in capital and expertise that are being used to improve both the physical and human infrastructure along the border. This is consistent with the original purpose of the maquila program: to provide a capitalization and technology-transfer function. Skilled workers at one maquila are moving to more sophisticated jobs at another. Some of

them are starting their own businesses with the skills they have learned.

Meanwhile, the maquilas themselves are undergoing change. Plants that previously limited their operations to assembly are branching out into product engineering and testing.

An example of this is SME, *Sistemas Mecanicos y Electronicos*. Located in Mexicali, across the line from the Imperial Valley in Baja California, SME is a twin-plant for AiResearch Tucson, which is itself a division of Allied-Signal Corp. Among other things, SME assembles sophisticated electronic devices such as cabin-pressure controls used in Douglas DC-9 aircraft. United States-made components are shipped from Tucson to Mexicali and assembled at SME. The completed assemblies are returned to the United States, where they are processed, packaged, and distributed.

Currently, SME limits its role to assembly. However, to make the plant more competitive, SME engineers are considering doing some product testing onsite in Mexicali. Such jobs would require advanced technical training—training that has frequently not been available in Mexico.

Anticipating these trends, Mexicali schools are working with maquila operators to increase resources, expand course offerings, and improve classroom quality. Recently, two trustees from a Mexicali technical college—both active participants in the local maquila association—traveled to Stanford University to attend a seminar on setting up and administering corporate fundraising campaigns to support educational programs. They plan to apply these techniques in Mexico to raise money from the maquila companies for school improvement. This is just one example of how the maquila "domino effect" is spreading throughout the border region, bringing the promise of a better life to people who have known little but poverty.

A second trend supported by the Wharton study is the growth of maquilas in Mexico's interior. Maquilas are still mostly a border phenomena. They accounted for 3 percent of total national employment in 1986, as opposed to 18 percent of employment in the five states bordering the United States—Baja California, Sonora, Coahuila, Chihuahua, and Tamaulipas. However, greater than 15 percent of all maquilas are now located south of these 5 states. This compares to less than 10 percent in 1979. The southward migration was another objective of the maquila program. Bringing maquilas to Mexico's interior helps promote balanced economic growth. It also strengthens public support for the program.

As might be expected, the interior maquilas use a higher percentage of Mexican-produced raw materials. The vast majority of their content comes from the United States, but not quite as much as their border counterparts.

However, this is changing. The Wharton study reveals that as the number of interior maquilas has grown, their reliance on Mexican content has declined. In 1986, Mexican raw materials represented only 4 percent of the total content processed by interior maquila plants. As recently as 1980, this figure was 10 percent. Nearly 96 percent of all content used by the interior maquilas comes from abroad—almost exclusively from the United States.

Along the border, a remarkable 99 percent of all raw materials used by the maquila plants comes from the United States.

Finally, maquilas will continue to play an essential role in generating surplus foreign exchange for Mexico. Wharton estimates that the maquila industry's foreign exchange surplus will increase from \$1.5 billion obtained last year to \$2.4 billion in 1992. This represents an annual growth rate of nearly 10 percent. Maquilas are already the single biggest generator of surplus foreign exchange in Mexico, ahead of oil exports and tourism. This is extremely important at a time when Mexico owes \$107 billion to foreign banks—much of it in the United States—and when they are slashing trade barriers to accommodate more United States imports.

In closing, I challenge my colleagues in Congress to do two things during this dual election year.

First, get the Wharton study and read it. This is especially important for those who are unfamiliar with the maquila program or who have been critical of it in the past. Copies of the study are available from the Department of Labor or my office.

Second, visit the Mexican border states and see the maquilas firsthand. I personally pledge to arrange and lead such a tour for my colleagues at mutual convenience.

The maquila program is too important to be ignored by nonborder legislators. Companies that supply maquilas with components are located in all 50 States. Nearly every congressional district is directly affected.

For my colleagues who hesitate to accept this challenge, don't just do it for yourself. Do it for your constituents who depend on trade expansion with Mexico for their jobs and their future prosperity.

RICHARD E. GUGGENHIME

HON. NANCY PELOSI

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 9, 1988

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, on July 13, San Francisco lost a great man and leading citizen with the death of Richard E. Guggenhime. Few citizens have given as much to the city and people of San Francisco.

A leader in civic affairs, he was president of the San Francisco Community Chest and the Rosenberg Foundation and a trustee of the California Academy of Sciences, the San Francisco Symphony Association, and the Branson School. He was also a director of the Bay Area Educational Television Association—KQED Channel 9—the San Francisco Legal Aid Society, and the California Chamber of Commerce.

As an attorney, Richard Guggenhime worked on the construction financing of the San Francisco-Oakland Bay Bridge and the merger of Wells Fargo Bank and American Trust Company. Under his leadership from 1959 to 1973, the San Francisco law firm of Heller, Ehrman, White & McAuliffe tripled in size.

Richard Guggenhime was also a prominent figure in the development of the modern Stan-

ford University. He served on the board of directors for two decades and was cochairman of the most successful fundraising campaign in the university's history.

In addition to a long list of civic and professional accomplishments, Richard Guggenheim will be remembered for an infectious wit and immeasurable devotion to his friends and family. Said his son Richard, "He loved the achievements of his family more than he loved his own. He never talked about himself but only of his family—particularly his wonderful Charlotte, who in her quiet way was an essential ingredient of his success."

Richard Guggenheim was many things to many people. He led by example and lived the words of the prophet Micah: "What does the Lord require of you but to do justice, to love mercy, and to walk humbly with God." San Francisco will miss Richard Guggenheim.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. JOEL HEFLEY

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 9, 1988

Mr. HEFLEY. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably absent for rollcall 267, on final passage of the United States-Canada Free-Trade Agreement. Had I been present I would have voted "aye."

A STORY OF HEROISM

HON. CONSTANCE A. MORELLA

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 9, 1988

Mrs. MORELLA. Mr. Speaker, I want to share with you a local story of heroism from which we can all learn.

Six-year-old Tiffany Corbin, of Silver Spring, MD, is a very special girl. She receives therapy for emotional difficulties at the Oak Leaf Center of Bethesda, a nonprofit community mental health outpatient facility that serves children, adolescents and their families.

With the help of local medical assistance programs, the center arranges taxi transport for Tiffany to and from school.

As Tiffany and two other girls, ages 4 and 10 years old, sat in the back seat of Alan Runyon's taxi on Friday, July 15, he noticed that something was terribly wrong. Tiffany was squirming helplessly. Within moments it was apparent that she had swallowed a large piece of candy and it was lodged in her throat. She began to suffocate.

Alan Runyon quickly radioed the Barwood Cab Co., to call an ambulance and, despite heavy rush hour traffic, pulled the cab to the side of the road. Then, keeping a cool head, he proceeded to perform the Heimlich maneuver on little Tiffany. After a few very tense moments, the asphyxiating clump of candy was dislodged.

As the ambulance arrived and took Tiffany to the hospital, Barwood contacted the Oak Leaf Center and Alan Runyon took the other two girls home. Afterwards, he visited Tiffany in the hospital. Without Alan Runyon's quick

thinking, Tiffany could have died before getting to the hospital.

Alan Runyon and the Barwood Cab Co., deserve praise for their outstanding handling of the situation. This story subtly reminds us all of our dependency on each other and the importance of helping one another. I am very proud to have Alan Runyon and Tiffany as constituents.

SUPPORT AMERICA'S COMMERCIAL SPACE PROGRAM

HON. GERALD B.H. SOLOMON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 9, 1988

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, today I am again requesting that my colleagues join me in sponsoring legislation prohibiting United States satellites from being launched on Soviet or People's Republic of China boosters.

Mr. Speaker, the Commercial Space Launch Act encourages the development of an American commercial launch industry for economic, national security and strategic reasons. It represents an excellent example of Government policy recognizing the advantages inherent in allowing the private sector to apply its entrepreneurial spirit to the industrial sector of the future—space.

Commercial launch activity may well represent the most active part of America's non-military space program over the next several years. There are contracts worth nearly a billion dollars for launches beginning in 1989.

Mr. Speaker, it is unfair to expect our commercial space industry to compete successfully against a Communist government's controlled economy.

Now that some satellite firms have applied for export licenses, we must reaffirm our opposition to governmental market interference by sending another clear signal—that the Chinese and the Soviet Governments will not be able to use Western-Spacecraft to subsidize their space program or other high technology programs by unfairly grabbing market shares from United States launch industries.

A NEAR TRAGIC EVENT

HON. DAN BURTON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 9, 1988

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, very often, a tragic event or a near tragedy inspires thoughts of basic values and principles. I was shocked to hear yesterday, along with millions of Americans, about the attempted assassination of Secretary of State Shultz in Bolivia. Can one conceive of a more vicious, cowardly, heinous act? Killing a man in the midst of a worldwide peace mission would indeed be the most outrageous of crimes. I can only express my profound relief at the failure of this dastardly deed.

Red McDaniel, the Great American hero who spent 6 years at the "Hanoi Hilton" as a prisoner of communism, recently told of

seeing a banner unfurled at a U.S. college campus during the 1970's. It said, simply: "There is nothing worth dying for." This unfortunate attitude exemplifies the reason that we have lost so much ground to communism since World War II. The Communists believe there is something worth dying for, and they are often prepared to die for it.

Mr. Speaker, the incident in Bolivia reminds us that there are many who despise us. We have our flaws. But our enemies do not hate us for our flaws, but for our strengths for our freedom, our values, our compassion, and our devotion to, in Lincoln's words, "A just and lasting peace among ourselves and with all nations." That is what Mr. Shultz was working for. That is what the terrorists were trying to kill.

SUPPORT FOR GOLD MEDAL TO MRS. JESSE OWENS

HON. CHARLES B. RANGEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 9, 1988

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, the U.S. House of Representatives approved H.R. 1270, a bill which authorizes the President to present a gold medal to Mrs. Jesse Owens, in recognition of the contributions to mankind by her late husband, Olympic star Jesse Owens. This important, and long overdue tribute to Jesse Owens was moved through the House under the able leadership of Representative LOUIS STOKES. Representative STOKES is to be commended for the role that he continues to play to insure that the U.S. Government honors in this manner such a deserving American.

I am a supporter of this legislation because Jesse Owens was an idol to me and countless other young people growing up in Harlem in the 1930's. He was an idol to my friends and I because he defied the odds and showed the world that black Americans could succeed, if only given the chance.

No words can express the pride that I felt when I woke up one morning to read the New York Times, and discovered that Jesse Owens had won not one, but four gold medals at the 1936 Olympic Games in Berlin. What an accomplishment! What a feat! I also remember reading that Adolph Hitler was so disgusted with Jesse Owens' performance, on his home soil, that he refused to congratulate him on his accomplishments, as he did the other Olympic medalists. Perhaps what hurt Adolf Hitler the most was the fact that Jesse Owens dispelled his ignorant theories of white supremacy on four separate occasions—right before his very eyes!

Mr. Speaker, Jesse Owens has gone down in the history books of the world as not only a revered sports figure, but as a genuine friend and humanitarian in the truest sense of the word. While many black Americans have succeeded in sports, I can think of no other person, black or white, who is more deserving of a Congressional Gold Medal than Jesse Owens.

I would also like to take this opportunity to commend Jesse Owens' widow, Ruth, for the

great work that she has been doing to keep his goals and dreams alive. She is able to accomplish this in her capacity as the chairwoman of the Jesse Owens Foundation, a non-profit, tax-exempt organization. Among the many things that the Jesse Owens Foundation does is to award academic and athletic scholarships to deserving youngsters across the country.

In closing Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues in the Senate to move quickly and approve this important and deserving legislation.

TRIBUTE TO DON AND ANNE MORDEN

HON. LES AU COIN

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 9, 1988

Mr. AU COIN. Mr. Speaker, today I would like to pay tribute to Don and Anne Morden who will celebrate their 40th wedding anniversary on September 4. Don and Anne have lived for the past 14 of those 40 years in Astoria, OR. Astoria is fortunate to have people like Don and Anne. They are among the people who, through their untiring leadership in church, school, business, and civic activities, help to weave the threads that bind a community together. From teaching middle school, to involvement in Rotary, to leadership in their local United Methodist church, to championing the cause of small business, to a variety of volunteer activities, the list of their contributions to life in Astoria goes on and on.

This occasion offers an opportunity to acknowledge the immeasurable value of an enduring union such as that of Don and Anne—not only to their parents, their children, and their grandchildren—but to the entire community. Their support for one another through their four decades of marriage has undergirded their service to others and is a source of strength for family, neighbors, and friends. I congratulate them on their 40 years of marriage and wish them continued happiness for many years to come.

IN HONOR OF THE JIMENEZ FAMILY—1988 GREAT AMERICAN FAMILY OF THE YEAR

HON. ESTEBAN EDWARD TORRES

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 9, 1988

Mr. TORRES. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call to the attention of my colleagues the honor that will be bestowed on some close friends of mine, the family of Mario and Celia Jimenez, at a special ceremony in the White House later this week.

Mrs. Nancy Reagan will host a reception on Thursday, August 11, 1988 to honor the Jimenez family as one of six Great American Families from throughout the United States. This program is sponsored by the American Family Society to promote family values and citizenship.

Mario and Celia own and operate their family restaurant in my district, having built

their taco stand, started 23 years ago, into a successful business in Pico Rivera, CA. During this time, they have provided jobs to local high school youth and have supported various school and charitable organizations.

During the holidays, Mario and Celia have helped those less fortunate by providing a Thanksgiving Day meal for senior citizens and for the homeless. Mario dedicates his time and resources to help many programs and activities that support quality education. He also serves on my congressional awards council, which recognizes the volunteer contributions of young people in my district.

As parents, Mario and Celia have tried to demonstrate to their children that they can succeed at anything they want, if they try their best and share with others. All of the Jimenez children work in the family business when they are not in school or in their own jobs in the community. Strong believers in education, Mario and Celia have encouraged each of their children to pursue their educational goals so that they may achieve their dream for the future. Their oldest children, Mary and Mario Jr. attend California State University, Long Beach; David is a student at Cypress College with plans to transfer to UCLA; Martha Jimenez is the future aerospace engineer in the family, she also attends Cypress College. Youngest daughter, Norma, has recently graduated from La Serna High School and is making plans to attend college this fall.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud of my friends, Mario and Celia Jimenez, for their unselfish work and for serving as role models to all of us. We admire and respect them for being outstanding citizens and friends. I ask my colleagues to join me in saluting one of America's great families, the Jimenez Family of Whittier, CA.

ASSISTIVE MONKEYS FOR QUADRIPLÉGIC VETERANS

HON. JOSEPH P. KENNEDY II

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 9, 1988

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing legislation along with my esteemed colleague, Congressman TOM RIDGE, that fulfills a national promise to assist the men and women who have fought so bravely to defend our country. This legislation would provide a means by which our service-connected veterans who are quadriplegic can maintain their independence in their homes. By providing quadriplegics with assistive monkeys, these veterans would be able to complete many daily activities that they otherwise could not perform.

Dr. M.J. Willard, of Boston University, has developed a program called Helping Hands. During the last 6 years, her research has been funded by organizations such as the Veterans' Administration and the Paralyzed Veterans of America. This program has trained Simian monkeys—also known as "organ-grinder monkeys"—to help quadriplegic and other severely disabled people with everyday problems. These highly trained monkeys can retrieve food and beverages from a refrigerator, heat

food in a microwave and then set up a meal for ingestion by its master. They can retrieve and reposition a dropped mouthpiece without which their master could not read or write. They can replace the chin rest, which if accidentally pushed away, would render the quadriplegic immobile by preventing his or her ability to operate their wheelchair. The monkey, guided by a mouth-held laser, can place desired VCR or audio tapes in their respective players. Along with a core of learned tasks, these monkeys are also taught specific procedures to meet individual needs.

This legislation establishes a 4-year pilot program which will train and deliver 20 of these monkeys to both service-connected quadriplegics and 50 percent service-connected disabled veterans who have become quadriplegic following an honorable discharge from the service. This legislation directs the Veterans' Administration to reimburse the "Helping Hand" Program for the costs incurred while training these 20 monkeys. Six months after placement in a prospective home, the veterans will assume the modest costs of caring for their Simian companions. The program will also be authorized to assist other veterans by providing information and referral services about future participation in this program.

The projected cost of this program is a modest \$200,000 per year—a small price to pay for a wealth of invaluable services. Congressman RIDGE and I would like to invite our other colleagues to support this noteworthy legislation to help our quadriplegic veterans.

TONY DOUGLAS GETS KIDS HIGH—ON LIFE

HON. PAUL E. KANJORSKI

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 9, 1988

Mr. KANJORSKI. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to the attention of my colleagues a truly outstanding resident of my district. Mr. Tony Douglas, of Mountaintop, PA, will be presented the "Pharmacist of the Year" award by First Lady Nancy Reagan later this week, but his achievements and contributions within the community extend far beyond his pharmaceutical skills. Besides being a top-notch pharmacist, Tony Douglas has another important pastime: in his own words, "Drug abuse is a hobby of mine."

Now that I have the attention of my colleagues, let me make it clear that Mr. Douglas is one of our Nation's foremost experts in the field of drug education and has been battling drug abuse for over 25 years, long before most Americans were aware that our Nation even had a drug abuse problem.

Mr. Douglas is a tireless campaigner against the inherent evils of drug abuse. He is a well-known speaker at area schools talking with students about the social pressures associated with drug use. His approach, however, is what sets him apart from others who relate drug horror stories to our children. He does not stand on a soapbox, simply preaching the ill effects of drugs; he instead communicates with students, telling them that drugs do provide a high, but it is a self-destructive high

that can ruin an otherwise promising life. His advice? Have the strength to resist drugs, which are so much a part of the environment in which America's youth grow up. He urges his listeners to find "another high": if basketball, tennis, or reading gets you high, go with it. We all have our special interests, we all have our "hot button," as Tony would say. "Find that hot button and throw yourself into it—be the very best you can be." This is the message Mr. Douglas tells his young audience.

Mr. Speaker, I am convinced that every community, indeed our entire Nation would be a better place to live if there were more individuals like Mr. Tony Douglas. Our children need to hear a positive message from their elders. Talking down to children or preaching to them the evils of drugs is certainly not the most effective communicative tool; we were all kids once, Mr. Speaker, and it's well known that kids are not always receptive to preaching of this sort. But communicating with them on a one-to-one basis, as concerned equals, elicits a positive response, a response that benefits everyone, most importantly the kids.

Our environment is permeated with drugs; this is no secret to anyone in this Chamber. But Tony Douglas shows to all of us that we can take the time to help our children grow, to pursue activities that will help them develop into self-respecting, contributing members of this society. Tony demonstrates to all of us that reaching a hand out and listening to the needs and questions of today's youth can have an important impact on their lives. I salute you, Mr. Douglas, not just for your personal achievements, but for the young lives you touch and influence every day. Your community, and your inspiration, and your leadership. You are the best weapon we have in our war against drugs.

HONORING JAMES C. DODD, JR.

HON. GEORGE (BUDDY) DARDEN

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 9, 1988

Mr. DARDEN. Mr. Speaker, it is my privilege today to recognize and honor James C. Dodd, Jr., of Marietta, GA, for his recent election as the new chairman of the Marietta Board of Education. He is the first black man ever to be elected as chairman. Mr. Dodd, a graduate of Marietta's Lemon Street High School, experienced an exciting 20-year career in the U.S. Air Force and retired from the Air Force as senior master sergeant in 1983.

Mr. Dodd's duties while in the Air Force included service with the crew of Air Force One. During his time in Washington, DC, Mr. Dodd served under Presidents Johnson, Nixon, and Ford, and worked closely with Henry Kissinger. He served through the Vietnam years, Watergate, and other international crises, but describes the silver platter of his career as the years he spent serving as a crew member of the Presidential wing. As he puts it "to be

from a poor family from the South and to be black—to be able to do all these things—I'm extremely fortunate."

Since his retirement from the Air Force, Mr. Dodd has returned to Marietta and continues to serve his country well through his active involvement in community affairs. In addition to his involvement with the Marietta School Board, Mr. Dodd is very proud of his membership with the NAACP and will be the chairperson of their State convention in Marietta in October. Mr. Dodd not only works full time for the U.S. Postal Service, but he also serves his community as an active volunteer.

Mr. Speaker, I invite my colleagues to join me in congratulating James C. Dodd, Jr. on his position as chairman of the Marietta School Board, and in thanking him for his many years of service and dedication to our country.

EAGLE SCOUT FRANK MATTHEW RIESER

HON. WILLIAM O. LIPINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 9, 1988

Mr. LIPINSKI. Mr. Speaker, it is with great pleasure that I call to the attention of my colleagues an exemplary young citizen who has become a resident of my district, Frank Matthew Rieser. He will be recognized this Saturday, August 13, at Our Lady of Mercy Catholic Church in Dayton, OH for achieving the highest rank in Scouting, Eagle Scout.

Matthew, as he is known, is joining the ranks of a very select group. The individual tasks which he had to complete are impressive alone. These tasks challenged every facet of his personality—mental, physical, psychological, and more. His accomplishment becomes even more notable when it is viewed cumulatively. The high caliber of this individual is illustrated by the entire sum of achievements and the perseverance of character he demanded.

In today's society, our youth are truly bombarded with a variety of lifepaths from which to choose. While the freedom of choice is in itself good, too often we hear of young people who are led astray by the ignorance of their years to a lifestyle they do not deserve. It is always refreshing to recognize young men who choose a constructive way of life and also excel at it. Though credit is certainly due to the family of this young man and to the Scout leaders who provided support, Matthew knows today that he can participate independently in society in a manner that will benefit himself as well as his community.

The achievement of attaining the rank of Eagle Scout lays an excellent base for a productive future. I'm sure my fellow Members of Congress join me in wishing this young man the best of luck in his future endeavors.

UNITED STATES-CANADA FREE TRADE AGREEMENT

HON. JOHN C. ROWLAND

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 9, 1988

Mr. ROWLAND of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, the House of Representative's overwhelming adoption of implementing legislation for the United States-Canada Free-Trade Agreement [FTA] on August 9, clearly reveals the widespread support this agreement has in the United States. H.R. 5090 is a quantum leap in bringing the benefits of freer trade to the United States, Canada and, indeed, the world. The FTA, once adopted by Congress and the Canadian Parliament, will create the world's largest liberalized trading area and set the stage for global trade in the 21st century.

The thanks that must be given to the myriad negotiators and those involved in guiding the FTA through Congress and the Canadian Parliament cannot be overstated. This herculean task was only accomplished by an unprecedented level of cooperation between United States and Canadian trade officials, between executive and congressional officials and between Canadian federal and parliamentary leaders. To these dedicated individuals, our gratitude can only be outdone by their own realization of the historic nature of their accomplishment. I trust this realization will not be lost on any of them.

I do not have to remind you, Mr. Speaker, of the growing economic power of the European Community. The United States-Canada FTA will place the North American continent in a prime position to fairly and aggressively compete with the EC in the decades ahead. The same can be said for North American trading relationships vis-a-vis Japan, the Pacific Rim nations, China and others. Liberalizing the economic borders between our two nations will also have the unspoken benefit of training United States industry managers to think in global, transnational terms. While this attitude is changing with every passing year, perhaps the only impediment holding United States businesses behind their Japanese, West German, English, and other foreign competitors is their relative lack of global vision. By broadening United States-Canada economic ties, United States industries will be forced to consider the international consequences of their decisions and will seek international opportunities with increased confidence.

As a Representative of the State of Connecticut, I would like to take a few moments to detail the many benefits the FTA will bring to my State and my constituents. Connecticut ranks second in New England for total trade with Canada behind Massachusetts. With nearly \$1.7 billion in trade between Connecticut and Canada, Connecticut does enjoy the most balanced trading relationship with Canada than any other New England State. These statistics represent a growing factor that is our bread and butter here in Congress, jobs. For example, Connecticut exports of telecommunications equipment and industrial machinery, which currently face Canadian duties of 17.8 percent and 9.2 percent respec-

tively, would see those duties phased out over 5 to 10 years. The increased export opportunities from this happening will mean more jobs in those industries and that is good news to my ears.

I am not naive enough to imagine that the FTA does not have now, or will have later, its detractors. If the U.S. economic engine is to continue to grow, however, the opportunities the FTA will provide for the vast majority of American workers and businesses cannot be lost. We cannot allow the adverse, short-term consequences to a minority prevent both nations from positioning themselves in the best way possible for the global trading environment that is dawning. The trading environment in the next century will not tolerate nationalistic trading policies, will not tolerate industries unwilling to plan and operate on a global scale, and will not tolerate economies that refuse to adapt. For our part, that is for those of us willing to work and sweat for freer trade, we should not tolerate those who want to guarantee economic decline. Hiding our heads in the sand of the "status quo" is to renege on our responsibility to the American people. The United States-Canada FTA is the American economic dream on an international scale. We must continue to dream that dream for our benefit and the benefit of our world.

"BY THE PASSION OF THEIR LIVES"

HON. WILLIAM E. DANNEMEYER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 9, 1988

Mr. DANNEMEYER. Mr. Speaker, fellow colleagues, below is a poem that my constituent Warren C. Vining III, Santa Ana, CA, wrote as a tribute to the *Challenger* crew. I believe that this poem captures the importance of our commitment to the space program and the continued exploration of space.

By the Passion of Their Lives

Earthborn
American grown
with iron in their veins
yet settled peace in their souls
they raced through time
never turning back
from the challenging call of tomorrow
Heads held high
with laughter in their mien
they saw the silent salute of stars
grace their destined lives
as they worked and cheered
their way to glory
grasping with their skills
the ancient story
of the restless need
to search and grow
beyond mortal limitation
—and doing so
reach immortal creation.

**DEDICATION TO A DIFFICULT,
BUT REWARDING PROFESSION**

HON. DEAN A. GALLO

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 9, 1988

Mr. GALLO. Mr. Speaker, I am indeed proud today to recognize a fellow New Jerseyan who has assumed a position of national leadership at a crucial time in the history of her honored profession.

Lucille A. Joel of Oradell, NJ, was chosen by her peers in June to serve as the 28th president of the American Nurses Association.

Her 8 years of prior leadership experience as past president of the New Jersey State Nurses Association and first vice president of American Nurses Association will provide Mrs. Joel with the insights needed to tackle a number of challenging questions facing her organization and her profession.

As Mrs. Joel assumes her new duties and responsibilities, the nursing profession is at a crossroads. Not so long ago, the nursing profession and the opportunities for service that it provides attracted a great many young people. Today, we face a shortage of nurses, with a 17-percent vacancy rate for nursing positions in New Jersey alone.

The need for an increasing number of dedicated and well trained nurses has never been greater. As our population ages and the number of senior citizens doubles by the year 2020, we must have nurses with specialized training to provide health care for older Americans.

Changing patterns of child care services will also provide increasing opportunities for specialists at the other end of the spectrum.

Lucille Joel is uniquely qualified to meet these challenges. As a member of the faculty of the Rutgers College of Nursing since 1979 and chairperson of the Department of Adults and the Aged, Mrs. Joel understands the need to provide the specialized training that prepares students for the changing needs of the profession.

As chairperson of the Food and Drug Administration Steering Committee on Nursing, she has a view of the national scope of the needs and opportunities facing her profession.

Mrs. Joel has been elected a fellow of the American Academy of Nursing—a clear indication of her unique qualifications that have brought her to this national leadership role.

Her dedication and her professional standing provide an example for others to follow. And, the fact that these accomplishments did not occur in a vacuum make them even more impressive.

Her husband, Attorney Richard Joel, her eight children and the rest of her family have been very supportive, campaigning for her in the recent national elections.

Her leadership qualities, combined with her enormous energy and her thoughtful, intelligent approach to problems, are well recognized within her chosen profession.

Once again, New Jersey has produced a leader for our times.

I know my colleagues share my pride in the accomplishments of Lucille Joel and stand ready to cooperate with her as she undertakes the challenges of her profession.

**LET'S ELIMINATE THE DIESEL
FUEL TAX AND HEIFER TAX**

HON. J. DENNIS HASTERT

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 9, 1988

Mr. HASTERT. Mr. Speaker, now that the House has acted, I would like to take this opportunity to encourage our colleagues in the other body to safeguard the provisions in the Miscellaneous Revenue Act that would repeal the diesel fuel tax for off-highway users and the heifer tax.

As you probably know, the budget reconciliation package from 1987 requires wholesalers to collect the diesel excise tax rather than the retailers. Although the law exempts agricultural and off-highway users from paying the diesel fuel tax, it still requires them to pay the tax and then apply to the Government for a refund.

This policy doesn't make sense. The result has been increased redtape and higher upfront costs on farmers by requiring them to pay a tax they do not owe.

The heifer tax is a very complicated requirement that would require cattlemen to capitalize the cost of raising replacement breeding livestock if the preproductive period exceeds 2 years. This burdensome provision would cost cattle producers an additional \$50 to \$100 for every replacement they raise.

As a cosponsor of legislation that would eliminate both the diesel fuel tax and the heifer tax, I am very pleased that the House has voted to repeal these taxes. Now, I encourage our colleagues in the other body to do the same.

**CONGRESSMAN JACK KEMP ON
DANGERS OF DUKAKIS FOREIGN
POLICY AND DEFENSE
PROPOSALS**

HON. HENRY J. HYDE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 9, 1988

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Speaker, last week in Chicago and Corpus Christi, Vice President BUSH made powerful speeches setting out his vision and goals for the foreign policy of the United States. As standard bearer of the Republican Party, he has demonstrated that his vision, and that of all Republicans, contrasts sharply with the weak foreign policies of the Democrats and Governor Dukakis.

I would like to call the special attention of my congressional colleagues and the American people to an important speech given last

week on these same topics by Congressman JACK KEMP.

Speaking on August 4 to the National Strategy Forum in Chicago, Congressman KEMP provided a comprehensive critique of the dangerous foreign and defense policies of the Dukakis Democrats. It is a critique which should be must reading for all who care about our Nation's future security and freedom.

JACK KEMP points to the difference between "the beef and the bull" in the Democrats' smoke-filled Atlanta platform. And, he notes how different this 1988 platform is in its anti-defense and antifreedom fighter message from the 1960 platform of John F. Kennedy, a President much invoked by the Dukakis Democrats.

JACK KEMP highlights five danger zones—key areas crucial to our security in the coming decade—in which Michael Dukakis has displayed an alarming weakness and naivete about international affairs which ought to concern every American voter.

These five Dukakis dangers discussed by Mr. KEMP are indeed shocking. They include: First, endangering deterrence; second, unsound arms control; third, giving up Central America; fourth, unsound defense spending and fifth, undermining the strategic defense initiative.

Mr. Speaker, I ask that JACK KEMP's August 4 speech to the National Strategy Forum be inserted into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. I urge all Americans to read, and take to heart, Mr. KEMP's depiction of the radically different visions of the future on which the American people will vote this November.

THE DANGEROUS FOREIGN AND DEFENSE POLICY OF MICHAEL DUKAKIS

It is an honor to be here at the National Strategy Forum. I am particularly pleased to be given the opportunity to cut through the fog the Democrats manufactured at their Atlanta convention and to get to what they tried so hard to obscure: the substance of Michael Dukakis' foreign and defense policy.

I saw a wonderful cartoon by Jeff McNelly last week. It was captioned, "Noted linguist Mike Dukakis mastering a new language," and it depicted the governor reading from a book called "conversational Republican." Michael Dukakis was carefully mouthing the words, "Free . . . enter . . . prise, private um, sec . . . tor, I'm a Contra too."

The cartoonist has hit upon one of the underlying truths of this year's race: namely that the Democrats have finally gotten the message that the American people do not support their policies. To win in November, they must attempt to sound like Republicans and suppress their true opinions.

They say that political conventions no longer feature smoke-filled rooms. But the Democrats showed in Atlanta that they can feature smoke-filled platforms. The 1988 Democratic platform is said to be the shortest ever written by either party in the 20th century—and its vague, 200-word sentences were obviously written to confuse and bore the reader.

Perhaps they hoped that no one would be able to read their true thoughts through all the smoke. But they were wrong. I've read it. And I have a message for Michael Dukakis: even when smoke gets in their eyes, the American people can tell the difference between the beef and the bull.

Governor Dukakis made much of the so-called Boston-Austin axis at the Atlanta convention, a reference to John F. Kennedy's 1960 team-up with Lyndon Johnson. But the similarity between the two tickets begins and ends with geography. In 1960, John Kennedy ran on a platform calling for aid to freedom fighters in Hungary and a modernization of America's nuclear deterrent. The 1960 Boston-Austin axis was absolutely clear on the subject of communism in Central America. Let me quote the platform. "We reaffirm our historic policy of opposition to the establishment anywhere in the Americas of governments dominated by foreign powers."

My friends, Michael Dukakis could not run on that Kennedy platform—because he is already on record as opposing its major planks. Notwithstanding his invocations of the name of John F. Kennedy, Governor Dukakis is not a Kennedy Democrat. He is a liberal Democrat of the McGovern era. In place of American leadership for the free world, Mr. Dukakis would substitute "multilateralism," that is, submitting decisions to other countries or to the United Nations.

When asked about President Reagan's decision to send U.S. naval vessels into the Persian Gulf, Governor Dukakis said, "I wouldn't have gone in alone." In response to a question about how he would respond if, during his presidency, Nicaragua invaded El Salvador, he replied "I would act in concert with our allies."

Governor Dukakis is wary of any unilateral American action to secure our interests. While most Americans greeted the liberation of Grenada joyfully, and welcomed the safe return of our medical students, Michael Dukakis announced his opposition.

While most Americans cheered the brave pilots who flew all night to destroy terrorist sites in Libya, Mike Dukakis announced this opposition.

And it's not that Michael Dukakis opposed those actions on prudential grounds. He was not exercising his much-vaunted "competence." His stands were ideological stands, based upon the liberal, Democratic notion that the United States really ought not to have a larger role in the world than, say, Norway. The governor has said that he believes the American people need to learn "humility" in international affairs. He thinks, and I quote, that "we had better put away forever the rather presumptuous notion that we have any right to tell other people how they can or should live."

Ladies and gentlemen, I don't think that's the way the American people want our presidents to talk or act. I think the American people believe that our values—the preciousness of each human life, the sacredness of free expression, the inviolability of religious freedom—do not just apply to Americans. Those rights are universal. And when some governments set about denying those rights and those values to their people, we can and should tell them how to live. Freedom and democracy are not mere American preferences which we seek to force upon others—they are God-given rights which we want to share as far and wide as possible.

Michael Dukakis is a great believer in the United Nations. That is consistent with his belief that as a nation we must learn humility. Well, there are dozens of petty dictators with microphones represented at the U.N. who would like nothing better than to humble the United States. But it mystifies me why Mike Dukakis thinks we need moral instruction from the organization which voted to equate Zionism with racism and

which daily condemns pro-Western nations while ignoring the abuse of human rights committed by communist governments.

FIVE DANGER ZONES

Michael Dukakis could not have run on John Kennedy's platform—and his own is too vague to make sense of. But we can get a glimpse of what foreign and defense policies would look like in a Dukakis administration by examining the record of Dukakis statements during the 1988 primary season. In five key areas, crucial to our security in the coming decade, Governor Dukakis has displayed an alarming weakness and naivete about international affairs which ought to concern every American voter.

(1) Endangering deterrence

How far the Democratic party has come. In 1960, they ran on modernizing our nuclear deterrent; today Michael Dukakis wants to ruin it. He has demonstrated again and again that he does not understand the role of military strength in deterring aggression and building a secure peace. He will not acknowledge, for example, that President Reagan's deployment of Pershing II and cruise missiles in Europe and the repair of America's crumbling defense capabilities during the first years of the Reagan administration brought the Soviets back to the bargaining table. In light of those blind spots, it shouldn't surprise us to hear that his idea of a good foreign policy is Jimmy Carter's foreign policy.

From weapons to strategy, Governor Dukakis seems to think that national defense can be handled like no-fault auto insurance. No matter who hits us, we pay the price.

Let's talk about the doctrine of deterrence—which has kept the peace between East and West for more than forty years. Michael Dukakis does not seem to understand that to be effective, the U.S. capacity to respond to attack must be credible. That credibility depends upon two things: adequate military hardware and manpower and—just as important—projecting the will to use them if necessary.

Governor Dukakis has a no-nonsense demeanor. Yet when it comes to our national defense, he suddenly turns into a ditherer. He is constantly finding weapons systems he thinks we don't need. The list of systems is too long to recite here, but a sampling of what Michael Dukakis opposes includes the MX missile, the single warhead ICBM or Midgetman (favored by defense-minded members of his own party), the B-1 bomber, the Stealth bomber, modernization of the aging fleet of B-52s, additional nuclear aircraft carriers, additional cruise missiles, deployment of the D-5 Trident submarine missile, and more.

If President Dukakis were successful in gutting those programs, our nuclear deterrent would be gravely endangered. One of the reasons Governor Dukakis doesn't realize just how foolhardy such unilateral disarmament would be, is that he does not fundamentally understand the Soviets or their intentions. He has told questioners that the Soviet Union needs no incentives for arms control because their domestic economy is their highest priority. "They're worried," he said, "about becoming a second rate economic power."

Governor Dukakis's ignorance is showing. The Soviets have never been a first-rate economic power, but they have never allowed domestic economic demands to interfere with continuing to expand the largest military arsenal in the world. Even under the new regime of Mikhail Gorbachev, we have

yet to see a change in the fundamental military posture of the Soviet Union. The Soviet weapons build-up continues across the board and the Soviets have not diminished their military assistance to their Sandinista and Cuban allies in Central America and Angola. I remain to be convinced that they will actually pull all of their invasion forces out of Afghanistan.

Soviet intentions do not worry Mr. Dukakis—but American intentions apparently do. Even someone such as James Schlesinger, who has served in Republican and Democrat administrations, recently said in *TIME* magazine that he wonders whether Governor Dukakis is "viscerally anti military."

As governor of Massachusetts, Michael Dukakis was one of only two governors who refused to allow his state to participate in an emergency communication system called the Ground Wave Emergency Network (GWEN). The GWEN network would permit the military to communicate around the country even in the presence of an electro-magnetic pulse following a nuclear attack.

For reasons known best to himself, Governor Dukakis does not want the United States military to be able to communicate if the U.S. were to suffer a first strike by the Soviets. His refusal to participate in the program was especially problematic since Massachusetts is the site of our primary radar station for detecting submarine-launched nuclear missiles. He has even refused, during his ten years as governor to visit Hanscom Air Force Base, the Air Force's premier electronics systems base. Ladies and gentlemen, we face the very real prospect of seeing a candidate elected who supports no modern strategic deterrent—not even those favored by fellow Democrats Les Aspin and Sam Nunn. Aware that his radical anti-defense posture was causing concern, Governor Dukakis recently came out with a new proposal for strategic modernization: adding four more warheads to each existing, three-warhead Minuteman III missile.

That kind of slap-dash approach to defense policy—to the security of our children—is appalling. The proposal is non-sensical. Since Dukakis is opposed to ballistic missile flight testing, these expensively revamped missiles would be useless as a deterrent. Moreover, defense experts agree that our Minuteman arsenal is vulnerable to a first strike—that's why so many of us support the modern MX missile, to be based in a mobile mode. Putting more warheads on an already vulnerable Minuteman missile, and opposing mobility for the MX missile, as Michael Dukakis does, is throwing away good money and undercutting deterrence.

Is that proposal a measure of Governor Dukakis's so-called "competence?"

(2) Unsound arms control

Candidate Dukakis has stressed his eagerness for arms control agreements with the Soviet Union. But in light of his policy of unilateral strategic disarmament by the United States, it's a safe bet that the Soviets will find nothing to negotiate about. Governor Dukakis has obviously forgotten Jimmy Carter's bitter lesson after he scratched the B-1 bomber. When his arms control negotiators met with their Soviet counterparts and asked what concessions the Soviet Union was prepared to make, for example on stopping the Soviet Backfire bomber, the answer was simple, "None." After all, said the Soviets, "We didn't kill the B-1, you did."

Governor Dukakis would go beyond devastating our negotiating leverage with the So-

viets. He has also endorsed arms control bans on testing of anti-satellite weapons, flight-testing of ballistic missiles, and on all nuclear tests. Michael Dukakis should know that the bans on flight testing ballistic missiles and on ending even the small current number of limited underground nuclear tests, would undercut vital U.S. modernization programs and the credibility of U.S. deterrent forces, and that neither the proposed nuclear test ban, nor an anti-satellite weapon ban could be effectively verified.

Governor Dukakis's positions on arms control seem to exist in a vacuum, unaffected by the behavior of the Soviets. He has endorsed "strict adherence to the SALT II and ABM treaties, as long as the Soviet Union does the same." Is it possible he does not know that the Soviet Union has long since violated both accords and that, furthermore, the SALT II agreement was never ratified and long ago passed its proposed expiration date?

If Michael Dukakis is in favor of one-sided U.S. compliance with existing and past agreements, what might the Soviets conclude about his intentions for future treaties? I see a real danger that a naive President Dukakis might sign far-reaching arms control agreements with Mikhail Gorbachev, which would drastically cut our deterrent forces, but with which the Soviets would not comply. Mr. Dukakis has promised honesty in government. But what about common sense?

(3) Giving up Central America

In 1961, a young American president said, "We shall pay any price, bear any burden, meet any hardship, support any friend, oppose any foe to assure the survival and success of liberty." Michael Dukakis and the liberal Democrats are not even willing to pay the price of defending freedom in Central America.

Here in our hemisphere, Michael Dukakis's policies would permit something which John F. Kennedy swore would never happen: the expansion of Soviet/Cuban hegemony. Michael Dukakis may have good Spanish language skills, but the word "libertad" does not seem to be in his vocabulary.

For that is what is at stake in Central America: the future of liberty and democracy in our hemisphere.

Sadly, Governor Dukakis sides with the radical leftists of his party in failing to confront the danger both to the region and to fundamental U.S. interests there.

The Sandinistas in Nicaragua are not, of course, a direct military threat to the United States. Opponents of aid of the democratic resistance are fond of ridiculing the idea that tiny Nicaragua represents a "threat" to the U.S. But that has always been a straw man. The danger is obviously not of an invasion by Nicaraguan forces against the United States—and the critics know it. Instead, the danger is that a consolidated Marxist/Leninist regime in Nicaragua, currently bankrolled at some \$30 million per month by the Soviet Union, will slowly and deliberately subvert its struggling democratic neighbors, as well as Panama and the strategic canal, and will eventually pose a major threat to Mexico.

Serious strategic thinkers doubt whether Mexico's fragile economy and unstable political system could withstand a prolonged period of subversion from a united, communist Central America. Today, Nicaragua, with a population under 3 million already has an army larger than that of Mexico with 70 million people, and it offers harbors and airfields to modern Soviet military

forces. Imagine what sort of threatening military strength could be amassed from a Central America united under communist rule and taking its marching orders from Fidel Castro.

Governor Dukakis has been a consistent opponent of aid to the Nicaraguan democratic resistance. He has called the President's policy "illegal and immoral." He claims to want the people of Central America to decide the destiny of Central America. Yet that is exactly what the Sandinista Communists are preventing.

By transforming their country into a staging area for the Eastern bloc; by inviting members of the PLO, the Red Brigades, and other terrorist organizations to feel welcome in Nicaragua; by building the third largest army in the Western hemisphere (next to the United States and Cuba), and by smuggling Soviet arms and supporting guerrilla forces in El Salvador, Honduras and Guatemala, the Sandinistas are trying to prevent the people of Central America from deciding their own destiny.

Just in the past month, Nicaraguans who attempted to have a say in their own destiny—the mothers of political prisoners, labor unions, and members of the opposition who took to the streets to protest the communist governments oppressive policies—were savagely beaten by the Sandinista police. The opposition newspaper, *La Prensa*, and *Radio Catolica* were closed.

Governor Dukakis may feel noble saying he wants self-determination for Central Americans, but by abandoning the democratic resistance in Nicaragua—as he has pledged to do—he will be allowing Central Americans the same degree of self-determination currently experienced behind the Iron Curtain by the Poles, the East Germans, the Rumanians, and the Bulgarians.

Nor can the Governor hide behind the Arias Peace Plan. The agreement, signed last summer, has been proved a failure. The Sandinistas took none of the promised steps toward demilitarization or democratization in Nicaragua. Nicaragua's political prisons remain full to bursting. Domestic opposition is brutally suppressed. And free elections are as far away as ever.

A President of the United States must understand that on issues affecting our national interest and our security, we cannot abdicate responsibility to international organizations or other countries. The first duty of the President of the United States is to preserve the security of the United States.

And there is a particular irony in the fact that Michael Dukakis, the son of Greek immigrants, should oppose aid to the resistance in Nicaragua. If a Democratic president named Harry Truman had not supported the forces of democracy in Greece, the cradle of democracy, when the communists attempted to take it over shortly after World War II, the land of Dukakis's ancestors would not be free or democratic today.

This ignorance is truly astonishing. Doesn't he know that in 1947, Harry Truman cited the Monroe Doctrine as the precedent for his intervention in Greece? President Truman did not wait until the Soviets had colonized Greece; he did not wait until Soviet aircraft were sitting on the tarmac in Athens; he acted swiftly to make sure that that would never happen by rushing aid to the resistance.

(4) Unsound defense spending

During the primary campaign, Governor Dukakis attempted to sound like a moderate by speaking of "stable" defense spending.

But he has also called for a \$100 billion cut in US strategic spending over the next five years, and large increases in spending for conventional forces in what he calls his "conventional defense initiative." His proposals are dangerous and misleading.

Governor Dukakis has called for a freeze in defense spending and for further reductions by closing down major defense programs including strategic bombers and missiles, SDI, new nuclear carriers, etc. In an earlier period of expanding defense budgets, an argument for a freeze could perhaps have been made—though I believe our defense spending must always be determined by our security needs alone and that America's defense catch-up of the early nineteen eighties was absolutely essential after years of defense neglect. But Michael Dukakis is proposing to freeze defense spending even after his fellow Democrats in the Congress have imposed four straight years of cuts in US defense spending.

Governor Dukakis' recent proposal for a "conventional defense initiative" is a typical mishmash. It ignores the planning which has gone into the existing Conventional Defense Initiative of the Reagan administration and NATO to strengthen NATO's defense posture against the vast superiority of Warsaw Pact conventional forces. And in proposing that as a major part of his initiative three recently formed US "light" divisions now be turned into new, heavily mechanized divisions—which would be very expensive to equip and to transport—Michael Dukakis is flying in the face not only of the military professionals, but also of the views of people like Senator Sam Nunn who want to provide flexibility and maneuverability to our forces.

Michael Dukakis is not only confused about the forces, but also about the costs and purpose, of his conventional defense initiative. At one time he talked about transferring some \$50 billion from our strategic force programs to conventional forces over the next five years, but more recently he has talked about spending some \$3 billion more a year on his initiative, in order, he says, to give NATO the capability for "winning" a conventional war in Europe.

Well, as former Secretary of Defense James Schlesinger—a Democrat of the "Scoop", not Jesse, Jackson school—has pointed out, the \$3 billion dollar figure is completely unrealistic for the proposed Dukakis conventional program and crudely "trivializes" the problem. And, as for "fighting and winning" a conventional war, Secretary Schlesinger has also pointed out that our European allies are interested in deterring a conventional war, knowing that their countries would be devastated even in a conventional war. NATO is postured for deterrence and defense. It is the Soviets and their Warsaw Pact allies that are postured offensively with forces, plans and exercises designed to initiate, fight and win war.

So, while I'm delighted that Michael Dukakis is interested in supporting some form of deterrent to Soviet aggression, I'm concerned that he wants to purchase the wrong kind of conventional improvements and for the wrong purpose, and that he proposes to do so at the expense of our fundamental strategic security. This is surely not a competent approach to serious defense issues, but a dangerous and monumental blunder.

(5) Undermining the strategic defense initiative

In at least one defense area, Michael Dukakis has made no attempt even to sound moderate. On the Strategic Defense Initia-

tive (SDI), he has embraced the extremist view of the left-wing of the Democratic party: namely, that it won't work and should never be built by the United States.

The consequence of that short-sighted policy would be to leave the American people utterly vulnerable to nuclear attack.

The strategic defense effort which Governor Dukakis has labeled a "fantasy and a fraud" is not considered so by the Soviets. They are currently spending an estimated \$20 billion per year on their own strategic defense program, or about five times as much as we, including a heavy investment in advanced programs.

It's interesting that both the Democrats and the Soviets say that our SDI will never work. But if that's true, why are the Soviets pushing so hard to get us to abandon our SDI? And why are they spending billions on their own, far larger strategic defense programs?

Governor Dukakis' position is that SDI is a "technological illusion," which we should be researching. But why research at all if he's so sure it's hopeless?

What neither Governor Dukakis nor the Democrats in Congress have faced up to yet is that we are moving, whether we like it or not, out of the age of Mutual Assured Destruction or MAD, and into the era of deterrence based increasingly on missile defenses. The Soviets already have deployed a two-layer missile defense in place around Moscow. They are building the capability through a variety of means, both exotic and standard, to provide a comprehensive air and missile defense for their entire territory.

Perhaps most ominously, they are engaged in a massive effort to militarize space, with many military space launches, a space station in orbit, and a capacity for heavy lift into space far exceeding our own capabilities.

Yet while the Soviets are attempting to move into the era of missile defense—they have more than 10,000 scientists at work on laser technology—they are also trying, through diplomacy and disinformation, to prevent us from doing the same. They clearly want a monopoly in strategic defense to go with their offensive capabilities.

Ladies and gentlemen, what Michael Dukakis does not understand is that we can have only two futures: one in which the Soviets will have a missile defense and we will not, or one in which both of us will have the ability to deter attack and to provide increasing protection for our citizens. That's the choice.

Now if Michael Dukakis were president, he would drastically cut funding for our strategic nuclear weapons and also restrict SDI to an arcane research program. He would give us the worst of both worlds. A weak deterrent, and a moribund defense.

Critics of SDI erect the straw man that an absolute defense is impossible. But who ever said anything about an absolute defense, and why not seek to strengthen deterrence so that there will never be an attack? In the current MAD world of Mutual Assured Destruction, all weapons get through, from whatever source.

Did we demand an absolute cure for all cancer before we began applying the knowledge acquired so far to patients suffering right now? Of course not. SDI will unfold in stages, just as our space program did once President Kennedy made the national commitment to put a man on the moon during the next decade.

Since it's obvious that Michael Dukakis has not been paying attention, let me advise

him that substantial progress has been achieved in every phase of SDI research: tracking, propulsion, miniaturization, and more. I have visited our SDI facilities and have seen this progress.

One thing is sure, while nothing in life is absolute, each new phase of SDI will strengthen deterrence, whether it's the ability to shoot down some missiles as they enter our airspace, or ultimately, the ability to destroy Soviet missiles just seconds after they are launched from their silos.

Each SDI phase will mean that Soviet planners will be less confident of a successful first strike. And each phase, such as an initial Accidental Launch Protection system, will provide an increased measure of protection against missiles from whatever source. Each will make an attack less likely.

George Bush solidly supports the Strategic Defense Initiative as a vital insurance policy for ourselves and our children and as something that will also greatly benefit our allies and the entire globe.

Isn't it ironic that while Michael Dukakis calls SDI "a fantasy," the U.S. has worked with our ally Israel, and others, to apply SDI technology to defend against missiles deployed in Syria and elsewhere in the Middle East. Is SDI technology "a fantasy" for Israel?

George Bush solidly supports both SDI and a policy of peace through strength. Michael Dukakis supports neither, and the Dukakis Democrats' position is incorporated in the dangerous Defense Authorization Act which President Reagan had to veto yesterday. The Dukakis Democrat position is a retreat from responsibility—a short-sighted and foolish policy which they will one day regret. I only hope that the entire country will not have to pay the price of their folly.

THE FUTURE OF FREEDOM

Those are five major foreign and defense policy areas where I believe the Dukakis Doctrine is tragically misguided. I think it is especially troublesome that he takes the radical positions he does at this time in history.

Ladies and gentlemen, the coming decade is one of great challenge to the United States. We have seen, during the past seven and a half years, an incredibly rich flowering of freedom around the world.

With President Reagan's great inspiration showing the way, millions of people around the world have participated in free elections for the first time. In Latin America, a number of countries which were under authoritarian governments have held free and fair elections. On every continent, governments have turned away from failed socialist policies and to free enterprise. And, of course, in the Soviet Union major changes are being proposed by Mikhail Gorbachev.

The next president of the United States must be able to take such global changes and challenges in stride, encouraging what expands freedom, sober about what constrains it. He must start with a philosophical rudder which will guide him through the rapids of the coming years.

American foreign and defense policies are outgrowths of our values. They cannot be cobbled together by a technocrat looking for ratification from the United Nations at every turn.

George Bush understands those values. He welcomes the new Soviet words of glasnost and perestroika. But he does so with the skepticism of an experienced statesman who judges actions, not words, not with the uncritical enthusiasm of a novice.

And beyond the values, George Bush has the knowledge and experience to lead America into a more secure future—assuring a modern nuclear deterrent, appropriately strengthening conventional forces, moving forward with deployment of the Strategic Defense Initiative, and seeking sound arms control.

Moreover, George Bush has spent a career dealing with the Soviets and with the leaders of the free world's nations. He has served as a diplomat, a CIA chief, and vice president. That experience gives him a wonderful advantage: he doesn't fool easy and he doesn't scare easy.

Under a Bush administration, those brave men and women who are risking their lives for freedom will not be abandoned by the United States of America.

Ladies and gentlemen, in November Americans will be asked to choose between two radically different visions for the future. Michael Dukakis offers cuts into the

marrow of our strategic deterrent and imprudent conventional force programs. He offers submission to the expansion of communism in our hemisphere, and timidity about American interests in the rest of the world.

In sharp contrast, George Bush will extend and expand the great strides freedom has made in the past seven years. He will make sure that the world knows America stands by her friends and is resolute toward the enemies of freedom. He will not shrink from the responsibility to provide for our common defense, to have effective deterrent forces, both strategic and conventional, and to build and deploy SDI as rapidly as possible. He will have sound arms control. He will not look over his shoulder and ask permission of the U.N. when it comes to protecting the forces of freedom and assuring America's national security.

As the Vice President said here in Chicago last Tuesday: "The American Century has

not drawn to a close. We are not in decline. America has set in motion the major changes underway in the world today—the growth of democracy, the spread of free enterprise, the creation of a world market in goods and ideas, for the foreseeable future, no other nation, or group of nations, will step forward to assume leadership. And as the 20th Century gives way to the 21st, the American republic will continue to represent mankind's last, best hope, the leader among nations seeking a more open and peaceful world."

George Bush will remind friend and foe alike that the United States still believes in the values of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness for the entire world, and not just for ourselves. In this he stands for what is best in America. In this Americans will support him as President.

Thank you very much.